

तमसो मा ज्योतिर्गमय

SANTINIKETAN
VISWA BHARATI
LIBRARY

951

H 89/2

**THE
SPIRIT OF THE CHINESE PEOPLE.**

鴻銘氏辜湯生著

原華

梁敦彥題

義大秋春

THE SPIRIT OF THE CHINESE PEOPLE.



WITH AN ESSAY
ON
Civilisation and Anarchy
BY
KU HUNG-MING, M.A. (Edin.)

SECOND EDITION

Es giebt zwei friedliche Gewalten:
das Recht und die Schicklichkeit.

Goethe



THE COMMERCIAL PRESS, WORK LTD.
PEKING.

1922.

DEDICATED

TO

L. SOYKA, ESQUIRE,

AN AUSTRIAN GENTLEMAN,

AS

A Token of Gratitude

FOR

His chivalrous and great kindness to me

and my family during the Revolution

in

China in 1911.

Note to the Second Edition.

The first edition of this book was published in 1915 during the great European war. In that first edition I printed as an appendix, an essay entitled, "The war and the way out." Now that the great war is over, there is no object in reprinting that essay. I have therefore instead printed another essay entitled "Civilisation and Anarchy," taken from a book "Papers from a Viceroy's Yamen" (now out of print), published just after the Boxer trouble in 1901.

Ku Hung-Ming

PREFACE

THE object of this book is an attempt to interpret the spirit and show the value of the Chinese civilisation. Now in order to estimate the value of a civilisation, it seems to me, the question we must finally ask is not what great cities, what magnificent houses, what fine roads it has built and is able to build; what beautiful and comfortable furniture, what clever and useful implements, tools and instruments it has made and is able to make; no, not even what institutions, what arts and sciences it has invented: the question we must ask, in order to estimate the value of a civilisation,—is, *what type of humanity*, what kind of men and women it has been able to produce. In fact, the man and woman,—the type of human beings—which a civilisation produces, it is this which shows the essence, the personality, so to speak, the soul of that civilisation. Now if the men and women of a civilisation show the essence, the personality and soul of that civilisation, the language which the men and women in that civilisation speak, shows the essence, the personality, the soul of the men and women of that civilisation. The French say of literary composition, “*Le style, c’est l’homme.*” I have therefore taken these three things, the Real Chinaman, the Chinese woman and the Chinese language,—as the subjects of the first three essays in this volume to illustrate the spirit and show the value of the Chinese civilisation.

I have added to these, two essays in which I have tried to show how and why men, foreigners who are looked upon as authorities on the subject, do not really understand the real Chinaman and the Chinese language. The Rev. Arthur Smith, who wrote the Chinese Characteristics, I have tried to show, does not understand the real Chinaman, because, being an American,—he is *not deep* enough to understand the real Chinaman. Dr. Giles again, who is considered a great sinologue, I have tried to show does not really understand the Chinese, language, because, being an Englishman, he is *not broad* enough,—he has not the philosophic insight and the broadness which that insight gives. I have wanted to include in this volume an essay I wrote on J. O. B. Bland and Backhouse's book on the famous late Empress Dowager, but unfortunately I have not been able to find a copy of that essay which was published in the "National Review" in Shanghai some four years ago. In that essay, I have tried to show that such men as J. O. B. Bland and Backhouse do not and cannot understand the real Chinese woman,—the highest type of woman produced by the Chinese civilisation viz the late Empress Dowager because such men as J. O. B. Bland and Backhouse are *not simple*,—have not the simplicity of mind, being too clever and having, like all clever modern men, a distorted intellect.* In fact, in order to understand the real Chinaman and the Chinese civilisation, a man must be *deep, broad* and

* Mencius says, "What I hate in your clever men is that they always distort things. 所惡於智者爲其鑿也" Bk IV. Part II. 26,

simple, for the three characteristics of the Chinese character and the Chinese civilisation are: depth, broadness and simplicity.

The American people, I may be permitted to say here, find it difficult to understand the real Chinaman and the Chinese civilisation, because the American people, as a rule, are broad, simple, but not deep. The English cannot understand the real Chinaman and Chinese civilisation because the English, as a rule, are deep, simple, but not broad. The Germans again cannot understand the real Chinaman and the Chinese civilisation because the Germans, especially the highly educated Germans, as a rule, are deep, broad, but not simple. The French,—well the French are the people, it seems to me, who can understand and has understood the real Chinaman and the Chinese civilisation best.* The French, it is true, have not the depth of nature of the Germans nor the broadness of mind of the Americans nor the simplicity of mind of the English,—but the French, the French people have to a preeminent degree a quality of mind such as all the people I have mentioned above as a rule, have not,—a quality of mind which, above all things, is necessary in order to understand the real Chinaman and the Chinese civilisation; a quality of mind viz: *delicacy*. For, in addition to the three characteristics of the real Chinaman

* The best book written in any European language on the spirit of the Chinese civilisation is a book called "La Cité Chinoise" by G.—Eug. Simon who was once French Consul in China. It was from this book that Prof. Lowes Dickinson of Cambridge, as he himself told me, drew his inspiration in writing his famous "Letters from John Chinaman."

and Chinese civilisation which I have already mentioned, I must here add one more, and that the chief characteristic, namely delicacy; delicacy to a preeminent degree such as you will find nowhere else except perhaps among the ancient Greeks and their civilisation.

It will be seen from what I have said above that the American people if they will study the Chinese civilisation, will get depth; the English, broadness; and the Germans, simplicity; and all of them, Americans, English and Germans by the study of the Chinese civilisation, of Chinese books and literature, will get a quality of mind which, I take the liberty of saying here, it seems to me, they all of them, as a rule, have not to a preeminent degree, namely, *delicacy*. The French people finally, by the study of the Chinese civilisation, will get all,—depth, broadness, simplicity and a still finer delicacy than the delicacy which they now have. Thus the study of the Chinese civilisation, of Chinese books and literature will, I believe, be of benefit to all the people of Europe and America. I have therefore added to this volume an essay on Chinese scholarship,—the sketch of a programme how to study Chinese, which I made for myself when I made up my mind and began, after my return from Europe, to study the civilisation of my own country, exactly now thirty years ago; this sketch of a programme how to study Chinese which I hope will be of help to those who want to study Chinese and the Chinese civilisation.

Ku Hung-ming
Peking, 20 April 1915 .

CONTENTS.



INTRODUCTION

1. The Spirit of the Chinese People.
2. The Chinese Woman.
3. The Chinese Language.
4. John Smith in China.
5. A Great Sinologue.
6. Chinese Scholarship, Part I.
7. Chinese Scholarship, Part II.

Appendix :—

Civilisation and Anarchy.

INTRODUCTION.

The Religion of Good-citizenship

Sage, thun wir nicht recht? Wir müssen den Pöbel betrügen,
Sieh nur, wie ungeschickt, sieh nur wie wild er sich zeigt!
Ungeschick und wild sind alle rohen Betrogenen;
Seid nur redlich und führt ihn zum Menschlichen an.
Goethe.

THE great war at the present moment is absorbing all the attention of the world exclusive of every thing else. But then I think this war itself must make serious thinking people turn their attention to the great problem of civilisation. All civilisation begins by the conquest of Nature, i.e. by subduing and controlling the terrific physical forces in Nature so that they can do no harm to men. The modern civilisation of Europe to-day has succeeded in the conquest of Nature with a success, it must be admitted, hitherto not attained by any other civilisation. But there is in this world a force more terrible even than the terrific physical forces in Nature and that is the passions in the heart of man. The harm which the physical forces of Nature can do to mankind, is nothing compared with the harm which human passions can do. Until therefore this terrible force,—the human passions—is properly regulated and controlled, there can be, it is evident, not only no civilisation, but even no life possible for human beings.

In the first early and rude stage of society, mankind had to use physical force to subdue and subjugate human

Arein't we just doing the right thing?the mob we must befool them;
See, now, how shiftless!and look now how wild!for such is the mob.
Shiftless and wild all sons of Adam are when you befool them;
Be but honest and true, and thus make human, them all.

II

passions. Thus hordes of savages had to be subjugated by sheer physical force. But as civilisation advances, mankind discovers a force more potent and more effective for subduing and controlling human passions than physical force and this force is called *moral force*. The moral force which in the past has been effective in subduing and controlling the human passions in the population of Europe, is Christianity. But now this war with the armament preceding it, seems to show that Christianity has become ineffective as a moral force. Without an effective moral force to control and restrain human passions, the people of Europe have had again to employ physical force to keep civil order. As Carlyle truly says, "Europe is Anarchy plus a constable." The use of physical force to maintain civil order leads to militarism. In fact militarism is necessary in Europe to-day because of the want of an effective moral force. But militarism leads to war and war means destruction and waste. Thus the people of Europe are on the horns of a dilemma. If they do away with militarism, anarchy will destroy their civilisation, but if they keep up militarism, their civilisation will collapse through the waste and destruction of war. But Englishmen say that they are determined to put down Prussian militarism and Lord Kitchener believes that he will be able to stamp out Prussian militarism with three million drilled and armed Englishmen. But then it seems to me when Prussian militarism is thus stamped out, there will then arise another militarism,—the British militarism.

which again will have to be stamped out. Thus there seems to be no way of escape out of this vicious circle.

But is there really no way of escape? Yes, I believe there is. The American Emerson long ago said, "I can easily see the bankruptcy of the vulgar musket worship,—though great men be musketworshippers; and 'tis certain, as God liveth, the gun that does not need another gun, the law of love and justice alone can effect a clean revolution." Now if the people of Europe really want to put down militarism, there is only one way of doing it and that is, to use what Emerson calls the gun that does not need another gun, the law of love and justice,—in fact, moral force. With an effective moral force, militarism will become unnecessary and disappear of itself. But now, that Christianity has become ineffective as a moral force the problem is where are the people of Europe to find this new effective moral force which will make militarism unnecessary?

I believe the people of Europe will find this new moral force in China,—in the Chinese civilisation. The moral force in the Chinese civilisation which can make militarism unnecessary is the Religion of good citizenship. But people will say to me, "There have also been wars in China." It is true there have been wars in China; but, since the time of Confucius 2,500 years ago, we Chinese have had no militarism such as that we see in Europe to-day. In China war is an accident, whereas in Europe war has become a necessity. We Chinese are liable to have wars, but we do not live in constant expectation of

IV

war. In fact the one thing intolerable in the state of Europe, it seems to me, is not so much war as the fact that every body is constantly afraid that his neighbour as soon as he gets strong enough to be able to do it, will come to rob and murder him and he has therefore to arm himself or pay for an armed policeman to protect him. Thus what weighs upon the people of Europe is not so much the accident of war, but the constant necessity to arm themselves, the absolute necessity to use physical force to protect themselves.

Now in China because we Chinese have the Religion of good citizenship, a man does not feel the need of using physical force to protect himself; he has seldom the need even to call in and use the physical force of the policeman, of the State to protect him. A man in China is protected by the sense of justice of his neighbour; he is protected by the readiness of his fellow men to obey the sense of moral obligation. In fact, a man in China does not feel the need of using physical force to protect himself because he is sure that right and justice is recognised by every body as a force higher than physical force and moral obligation is recognised by every body as something which must be obeyed. Now if you can get all mankind to agree to recognise right and justice, as a force higher than physical force, and moral obligation as something which must be obeyed, then the use of physical force will become unnecessary; then there will be no militarism in the world. But of course there will be in every country a few people, criminals, and in the world, a few savages who will not or-

are not able to recognise right and justice as a force higher than physical force and moral obligation as something which must be obeyed. Thus against criminals and savages a certain amount of physical or police force and militarism will always be necessary in every country and in the world.

But people will say to me how are you to make mankind recognise right and justice as a force higher than physical force. I answer the first thing you will have to do is to convince mankind of the efficacy of right and justice, convince them that right and justice is a power; in fact, convince them of the *power of goodness*. But then again how are you to do this? Well,—in order to do this, the Religion of good citizenship in China teaches every child as soon as he is able to understand the meaning of words, that *the Nature of man is good*.*

Now the fundamental unsoundness of the civilisation of Europe to-day, it seems to me, lies in its wrong conception of human nature; its conception that human nature is evil and because of this wrong conception, the whole structure of society in Europe has always rested upon force. The two things which the people of Europe have depended upon to maintain civil order are Religion and Law. In other words, the population of Europe have been kept in order by the fear of God and the fear of the Law. Fear implies the use of force. Therefore

*The first sentence of the first book that is put into the hands of every child in China when he goes to school.

VI

in order to keep up the fear of God, the people of Europe had at first to maintain a large number of expensive idle persons called *priests*. That, to speak of nothing else, meant so much expense, that it at last became an unbearable burden upon the people. In fact in the thirty years war of the Reformation, the people of Europe tried to get rid of the priest. After having got rid of the priests who kept the population in order by the fear of God, the people of Europe tried to maintain civil order by the fear of the Law. But to keep up the fear of the Law, the people of Europe have had to maintain another class of still more expensive idle persons called *policemen and soldiers*. Now the people of Europe are beginning to find out that the maintenance of policemen and soldiers to keep civil order, is still more ruinously expensive than even the maintenance of priests. In fact, as in the thirty years war of the Reformation, the people of Europe wanted to get rid of the priest, so in this present war, what the people of Europe really want, is to get rid of the soldier. But the alternatives before the people of Europe if they want to get rid of the policeman and soldier, is either to call back the priest to keep up the the fear of God or to find something else which, like the fear of God and the fear of the Law, will help them to maintain civil order. That, to put the question broadly, I think, everybody will admit, is the great problem of civilisation before the people of Europe after this war.

Now after the experience which they have had with the priests, I do not think the people of Europe will want .

to call back the the priests. Bismarck has said, "We will never go back to Canossa." Besides, even if the priests are now called back, they would be useless, for the fear of God is gone from the people of Europe. The only other alternative before the people of Europe therefore, if they want to get rid of the policeman and soldier, is to find something else, which, like the fear of God and the fear of the Law, can help them to maintain civil order. Now this something I believe, as I have said, the people of Europe will find in the Chinese civilisation. This something is what I have called the Religion of good citizenship. This Religion of good citizenship in China is a religion which can keep the population of a country in order without priest and without policeman or soldier. In fact with this Religion of good citizenship, the population of China, a population as large, if not larger than the whole population of the Continent of Europe, are actually and practically kept in peace and order without priest and without policeman or soldier. In China, as every one who has been in this country knows, the priest and the policeman or soldier, play a very subordinate, a very insignificant part in helping to maintain public order. Only the most ignorant class in China require the priest and only the worst, the criminal class in China, require the policeman or soldier to keep them in order. Thus I say if the people of Europe really want to get rid of Religion and Militarism, of the priest and soldier which have caused them so much trouble and bloodshed, they will have to come to China to get this, what I have called the Religion of good citizenship.

VIII

In short what I want to call the attention of the people of Europe and America to, just at this moment when civilisation seems to be threatened with bankruptcy, is that there is an invaluable and hitherto unsuspected asset of civilisation here in China. The asset of civilisation is not the trade, the railway, the mineral wealth, gold, silver, iron or coal in this country. The asset of civilisation of the world to-day, I want to say here, is the Chinaman,—*the unspoilt real Chinaman* with his Religion of good citizenship. The real Chinaman, I say, is an invaluable asset of civilisation, because *he is a person who costs the world little or nothing to keep him in order*. Indeed I would like here to warn the people of Europe and America not to destroy this invaluable asset of civilisation, not to change and spoil the real Chinaman as they are now trying to do with their New Learning. If the people of Europe and America succeed in destroying the real Chinaman, the Chinese type of humanity; succeed in transforming the real Chinaman into a European or American, i.e., to say, a person who will require a priest or soldier to keep him in order, then surely they will increase the burden either of Religion or of Militarism of the world,—this last item at this moment already becoming a danger and menace to civilisation and humanity. But on the other hand, suppose one could by some means or other change the European or American type of humanity, transform the European or American into a real Chinaman who will then not require a priest or soldier to keep him in order,—just think what a burden will be taken off from the world.

IX

But now to sum up in a few plain words the great problem of civilisation in Europe arising out of this war. The people of Europe, I say, at first tried to maintain civil order by the help of the priest. But after a while, the priest cost too much expense and trouble. The people of Europe then, after the thirty years war, sent away the priest and called in the policeman and soldier to maintain civil order. But now they find the policeman and soldier are causing more expense and trouble even than the priests. Now what are the people of Europe to do? Send away the soldier and call back the priest? No, I do not believe the people of Europe will want to call back the priest. Besides the priest now would be useless. But then what are the people of Europe to do? I see Professon Lowes Dickinson of Cambridge in an article in the Atlantic Monthly, entitled "The War and the Way out," says: "Call in the mob." I am afraid the mob when once called in to take the place of the priest and soldier, will give more trouble than even the priest and the soldier. The priests and soldiers in Europe have caused wars, but the mob will bring revolution and anarchy* and then the state of Europe will be worse than before. Now my advice to the people of Europe is: Do not call back the priest, and for goodness sake don't call in the mob,—but call in the Chinaman; *call in the real Chinaman with his Religion of good citizenship and his experience of 2,500 years how to live in peace without priest and without soldier.*

*or Bolshevism as we see it now in Russia.

X

In fact I really believe that the people of Europe will find the solution of the great problem of civilisation after this war,—here in China. There is, I say here again, an invaluable, but hitherto unsuspected asset of civilisation here in China, and the asset of civilisation is the real Chinaman. The real Chinaman is an asset of civilisation because he has the secret of a new civilisation which the people of Europe will want after this great war, and the secret of that new civilisation is what I have called the Religion of good citizenship. The first principle of this Religion of good citizenship is to believe that the *Nature of Man is good*; to believe in the power of goodness; to believe in the power and efficacy of what the American Emerson calls the law of love and justice. But what is the law of love? The Religion of good citizenship teaches that the law of love means to *love your father and mother*. And what is the law of justice? The Religion of good citizenship teaches that the law of justice means to be true, to be faithful, to be *loyal*; that every woman must be selflessly, absolutely loyal to her husband, that every man in every country must be selflessly *absolutely loyal to his sovereign*, to his King or Emperor. In fact the highest duty in this Religion of good citizenship, I want to say finally here, is the *Duty of Loyalty*, loyalty not only in deed, but loyalty in spirit or as Tennyson puts it,

To reverence the King as if he were
Their conscience and their conscience as their King,
To break the heathen and uphold the Christ.

The Spirit of the Chinese People.

(A Paper that was to have read before the Oriental
Society of Peking.)

LET me first of all explain to you what I propose, with your permission, this afternoon to discuss. The subject of our paper I have called "The Spirit of the Chinese people." I do not mean here merely to speak of the character or characteristics of the Chinese people. Chinese characteristics have often been described before, but I think you will agree with me that such description or enumeration of the characteristics of the Chinese people hitherto have given us no picture at all of the inner being of the Chinaman. Besides, when we speak of the character or characteristics of the Chinese, it is not possible to generalize. The character of the Northern Chinese, as you know, is as different from that of the Southern Chinese as the character of the Germans is different from that of the Italians.

But what I mean by the spirit of the Chinese people, is the spirit by which the Chinese people live, something constitutionally distinctive in the mind, temper and sentiment of the Chinese people which distinguishes them from all other people, especially from the people of modern Europe and America. Perhaps I can best express what I mean by calling the subject of our discussion the Chinese type of humanity, or, to put it in plainer and shorter words, the *real Chinaman*.

Now, what is the real Chinaman? That, I am sure, you will all agree with me, is a very interesting subject, especially at the present moment, when from what we see going on around us in China to-day, it would seem that the Chinese type of humanity—the real Chinaman—is going to disappear and, in his place, we are going to have a new type of humanity—the progressive or modern Chinaman. In fact I propose that before the real Chinaman, the old Chinese type of humanity, disappears altogether from the world, we should take a good last look at him and see if we can find anything organically distinctive in him which makes him so different from all other people and from the new type of humanity which we see rising up in China to-day.

Now the first thing, I think, which will strike you in the old Chinese type of humanity is that there is nothing wild, savage or ferocious in him. Using a term which is applied to animals, we may say of the real Chinaman, that he is a *domesticated* creature. Take a man of the lowest class of the population in China and, I think, you will agree with me that there is less of animality in him, less of the wild animal, of what the Germans call *Rohheit*, than you will find in a man of the same class in a European society. In fact, the one word, it seems to me, which will sum up the impression which the Chinese type of humanity makes upon you is the English word “gentle.” By gentleness I do not mean softness of nature or weak submissiveness. “The docility of the Chinese,” says the late Dr. D. J. Macgowan, “is not the docility of a

broken-spirited, emasculated people.' But by the word 'gentle' I mean absence of hardness, harshness, roughness, or violence, in fact of anything which jabs upon you. There is in the true Chinese type of humanity an air, so to speak, of a quiet, sober, chastened mellowness, such as you find in a piece of well-tempered metal. Indeed the very physical and moral imperfections of a real Chinaman are, if not redeemed, at least softened by this quality of gentleness in him. The real Chinaman may be coarse, but there is no grossness in his coarseness. The real Chinaman may be ugly, but there is no hideousness in his ugliness. The real Chinaman may be vulgar, but there is no aggressiveness, no blatancy in his vulgarity. The real Chinaman may be stupid, but there is no absurdity in his stupidity. The real Chinaman may be cunning, but there is no malignity in his cunning. In fact what I want to say is, that even in the faults and blemishes of body, mind and character of the real Chinaman, there is nothing which revolts you. It is seldom that you will find a real Chinaman of the old school, even of the lowest type, who is positively repulsive.

I say that the total impression which the Chinese type of humanity makes upon you is that he is gentle, that he is inexpressibly gentle. When you analyse this quality of inexpressible gentleness in the real Chinaman, you will find that it is the product of a combination of two things, namely, sympathy and intelligence. I have compared the Chinese type of humanity to a domesticated animal. Now what is that which makes a domesticated animal so

different from a wild animal? It is something in the domesticated animal which we recognise as distinctively *human*. But what is distinctively human as distinguished from what is animal? It is intelligence. But the intelligence of a domesticated animal is not a thinking intelligence. It is not an intelligence which comes to him from reasoning. Neither does it come to him from instinct, such as the intelligence of the fox,—the vulpine intelligence which knows where eatable chickens are to be found. This intelligence which comes from instinct, of the fox, all,—even wild, animals have. But this, what may be called *human* intelligence of a domesticated animal is something quite different from the vulpine or animal intelligence. This intelligence of a domesticated animal is an intelligence which comes not from reasoning nor from instinct, but from *sympathy*, from a feeling of love and attachment. A thorough-bred Arab horse understands his English master not because he has studied English grammar nor because he has an instinct for the English language, but because he loves and is attached to his master. This is what I call human intelligence, as distinguished from mere vulpine or animal intelligence. It is the possession of this human quality which distinguishes domesticated from wild animals. In the same way, I say, it is the possession of this sympathetic and true human intelligence, which gives to the Chinese type of humanity, to the real Chinaman, his inexpressible gentleness.

I once read somewhere a statement made by a foreigner who had lived in both countries, that the longer a foreigner lives in Japan the more he dislikes the Japanese, whereas the longer a foreigner lives in China the more he likes the Chinese. I do not know if what is said of the Japanese here, is true. But, I think, all of you who have lived in China will agree with me that what is here said of the Chinese is true. It is a—well known fact that the liking—you may call it the taste for the Chinese—grows upon the foreigner the longer he lives in this country. There is an indistinguishable something in the Chinese people which, in spite of their want of habits of cleanliness and refinement, in spite of their many defects of mind and character, makes foreigners like them as foreigners like no other people. This indescribable something which I have defined as gentleness, softens and mitigates, if it does not redeem, the physical and moral defects of the Chinese in the hearts of foreigners. This gentleness again is, as I have tried to show you, the product of what I call sympathetic or true human intelligence—an intelligence which comes not from reasoning nor from instinct, but from sympathy—from the power of sympathy. Now what is the secret of the power of sympathy of the Chinese people?

I will here venture to give you an explanation—a hypothesis, if you like to call it so—of the secret of this power of sympathy in the Chinese people and my explanation is this. The Chinese people have this power, this strong power of sympathy, because they live wholly,

or almost wholly, a life of the heart. The whole life of Chinaman is a life of feeling—not feeling in the sense of sensation which comes from the bodily organs, nor feeling in the sense of passions which flow, as you would say, from the nervous system, but feeling in the sense of emotion or *human affection* which comes from the deepest part of our nature—the heart or soul. Indeed I may say here that the real Chinaman lives so much a life of emotion or human affection, a life of the soul, that he may be said sometimes to neglect more than he ought to do, even the necessary requirements of the life of the sense of a man living in this world composed of body and soul. That is the true explanation of the insensibility of the Chinese to the physical discomforts of unclean surroundings and want of refinement. But that is neither here nor there.

The Chinese people, I say, have the power of sympathy because they live wholly a life of the heart—a life of emotion or human affection. Let me here, first of all, give you two illustrations of what I mean by living a life of the heart. My first illustration is this. Some of you may have personally known an old friend and colleague of mine in Wuchang—known him when he was Minister of the Foreign Office here in Peking—Mr. Liang Tun-yen. Mr. Liang told me, when he first received the appointment of the Customs Taotai of Hankow, that what made him wish and strive to become a great mandarin, to wear the red button, and what gave him pleasure then in receiving this appointment, was not because he cared for the red button, not because he would henceforth be rich and

independent,—and we were all of us very poor then in Wuchang,—but because he wanted to rejoice, because this promotion and advancement of his would *gladden the heart of his old mother in Canton*. That is what I mean when I say that the Chinese people live a life of the heart—a life of emotion or human affection.

My other illustration is this. A Scotch friend of mine in the Customs told me he once had a Chinese servant who was a perfect scamp, who lied, who “squeezed,” and who was always gambling, but when my friend fell ill with typhoid fever in an out-of-the-way port where he had no foreign friend to attend to him, this awful scamp of a Chinese servant nursed him with a care and devotion which he could not have expected from an intimate friend or near relation. Indeed I think what was once said of a woman in the Bible may also be said, not only of the Chinese servant, but of the Chinese people generally:— “Much is forgiven them, because they *love* much.” The eyes and understanding of the foreigner in China see many defects and blemishes in the habits and in the character of the Chinese, but his heart is attracted to them, because the Chinese have a heart, or, as I said, live a life of the heart—a life of emotion or human affection.

Now we have got, I think, a clue to the secret of sympathy in the Chinese people—the power of sympathy which gives to the real Chinaman that sympathetic or true human intelligence, making him so inexpressibly gentle. Let us next put this clue or hypothesis to the test. Let us see whether with this clue that the Chinese people live a

life of the heart we can explain not only detached facts such as the two illustrations I have given above, but also general characteristics which we see in the actual life of the Chinese people.

First of all let us take the Chinese language. As the Chinese live a life of the heart, the Chinese language, I say, is also a language of the heart. Now it is a well-known fact that children and uneducated persons among foreigners in China learn Chinese very easily, much more so than grown-up and educated persons. What is the reason of this? The reason, I say, is because children and uneducated persons think and speak with the language of the heart, whereas educated men, especially men with the modern intellectual education of Europe, think and speak with the language of the head or intellect. In fact, the reason why educated foreigners find it so difficult to learn Chinese, is because they are too educated, too intellectually and scientifically educated. As it is said of the Kingdom of Heaven so it may also be said of the Chinese language:— "Unless you become as little children, you cannot learn it."

Next let us take another well-known fact in the life of the Chinese people. The Chinese, it is well-known, have wonderful memories. What is the secret of this? The secret is: the Chinese remember things with the heart and not with the head. The heart with its power of sympathy, acting as glue, can retain things much better than the head or intellect which is hard and dry. It is, for instance, also for this reason that we all of us can

remember things which we learnt when we were children much better than we can remember things which we learnt in mature life. As children, like the Chinese, we remember things with the heart and not with the head.

Let us next take another generally admitted fact in the life of the Chinese people--their politeness. The Chinese are, it has often been remarked, a peculiarly polite people. Now what is the essence of true politeness? It is consideration for the feelings of others. The Chinese are polite because, living a life of the heart, they know their own feelings and that makes it easy for them to show consideration for the feelings of others. The politeness of the Chinese, although not elaborate like the politeness of the Japanese, is pleasing because it is, as the French beautifully express it, *la politesse du coeur*, the politeness of the heart. The politeness of the Japanese, on the other hand, although elaborate, is not so pleasing, and I have heard some foreigners express their dislike of it, because it is what may be called a rehearsal politeness—a politeness learnt by heart as in a theatrical piece. It is not a spontaneous politeness which comes direct from the heart. In fact the politeness of the Japanese is like a flower without fragrances, whereas the politeness of a really polite Chinese has a perfume like the aroma of a precious ointment—*instar unguenti fragrantis*—which comes from the heart.

Last of all, let us take another characteristic of the Chinese people, by calling attention to which the Rev. Arthur Smith has made his reputation, viz.:—want of

exactness. Now what is the reason for this want of exactness in the ways of the Chinese people? The reason, I say again, is because the Chinese live a life of the heart. The heart is a very delicate and sensitive balance. It is not like the head or intellect, a hard, stiff, rigid instrument. You cannot with the heart think with the same steadiness, with the same rigid exactness as you can with the head or intellect. At least, it is extremely difficult to do so. In fact, the Chinese pen or pencil which is a soft brush, may be taken as a symbol of the Chinese mind. It is very difficult to write or draw with it, but when you have once mastered the use of it, you will, with it, write and draw with a beauty and grace which you cannot do with a hard steel pen.

Now the above are a few simple facts connected with the life of the Chinese people which anyone, even without any knowledge of Chinese, can observe and understand, and by examining these facts, I think, I have made good my hypothesis that the Chinese people live a life of the heart.

Now it is because the Chinese live a life of the heart, the life of a child, that they are so primitive in many of their ways. Indeed, it is a remarkable fact that for a people who have lived so long in the world as a great nation, the Chinese people should to this day be so primitive in many of their ways. It is this fact which has made superficial foreign students of China think that the Chinese have made no progress in their civilisation and that the Chinese civilisation is a stagnant one. Nevertheless, it

must be admitted that, as far as pure intellectual life goes, the Chinese are, to a certain extent, a people of arrested development. The Chinese, as you all know, have made little or no progress not only in the physical, but also in the pure abstract sciences such as mathematics, logic and metaphysics. Indeed the very words "science" and "logic" in the European languages have no exact equivalent in the Chinese language. The Chinese, like children who live a life of the heart, have no taste for the abstract sciences, because in these the heart and feelings are not engaged. In fact, for everything which does not engage the heart and feelings, such as tables of statistics, the Chinese have a dislike amounting to aversion. But if tables of statistics and the pure abstract sciences fill the Chinese with aversion, the physical sciences as they are now pursued in Europe, which require you to cut up and mutilate the body of a living animal in order to verify a scientific theory, would inspire the Chinese with repugnance and horror.

The Chinese, I say, as far as pure intellectual life goes, are to a certain extent, a people of arrested development. The Chinese to this day live the life of a child, a life of the heart. In this respect, the Chinese people, old as they are as a nation, are to the present day, a nation of children. But then it is important you should remember that this nation of children, who live a life of the heart, who are so primitive in many of their ways, have yet a *power of mind and rationality* which you do not find in a primitive people, a power of mind and rationality which has enabled

them to deal with the complex and difficult problems of social life, government and civilisation with a success which, I will venture to say here, the ancient and modern nations of Europe have not been able to attain—a success so signal that they have been able practically and actually to keep in peace and order a greater portion of the population of the Continent of Asia under a great Empire.

In fact, what I want to say here, is that the wonderful peculiarity of the Chinese people is not that they live a life of the heart. All primitive people also live a life of the heart. The Christian people of mediæval Europe, as we know, also lived a life of the heart. Matthew Arnold says:—"The poetry of mediæval Christianity lived by the heart and imagination." But the wonderful peculiarity of the Chinese people, I want to say here, is that, while living a life of the heart, the life of a child, they yet have a power of mind and rationality which you do not find in the Christian people of mediæval Europe or in any other primitive people. In other words, the wonderful peculiarity of the Chinese is that for a people, who have lived so long as a grown-up nation, as a nation of adult reason, they are yet able to this day to live the life of a child—a life of the heart.

Instead, therefore, of saying that the Chinese are a people of arrested development, one ought rather to say that the Chinese are a people who never grow old. In short the wonderful peculiarity of the Chinese people as a race, is that they possess the secret of perpetual youth.

Now we can answer the question which we asked in the beginning:—What is the real Chinaman? The real Chinaman, we see now, is a man who lives the life of a man of adult reason with the heart of a child. In short the real Chinaman is a person *with the head of a grown-up man and the heart of a child*. The Chinese^{*} spirit, therefore, is a spirit of perpetual youth, the spirit of national immortality. Now what is the secret of this national immortality in the Chinese people? You will remember that in the beginning of this discussion I said that what gives to the Chinese type of humanity—to the real Chinaman—his inexpressible gentleness is the possession of what I called sympathetic or true human intelligence. This true human intelligence, I said, is the product of a combination of two things, sympathy and intelligence. It is a working together in harmony of the heart and head. In short it is a happy union of soul with intellect. Now if the spirit of the Chinese people is a spirit of perpetual youth, the spirit of national immortality, the secret of this immortality is this happy union of soul with intellect.

You will now ask me where and how did the Chinese people get this secret of national immortality—this happy union of soul with intellect, which has enabled them as a race and nation to live a life of perpetual youth? The answer, of course, is that they got it from their civilisation. Now you will not expect me to give you a lecture on Chinese civilisation within the time at my disposal. But I

will try to tell you something of the Chinese civilisation which has a bearing on our present subject of discussion.

Let me first of all tell you that there is, it seems to me, one great fundamental difference between the Chinese civilisation and the civilisation of modern Europe. Here let me quote an admirable saying of a famous living art critic, Mr. Bernard Berenson. Comparing European with Oriental art, Mr. Berenson says:—"Our European art has the fatal tendency to become science and we hardly possess a masterpiece which does not bear the marks of having been *a battlefield for divided interests.*" Now what I want to say of the European civilisation is that it is, as Mr. Berenson says of European art, a battlefield for divided interests; a continuous warfare for the divided interests of science and art on the one hand, and of religion and philosophy on the other; in fact a terrible battlefield where the head and the heart—the soul and the intellect—come into constant conflict. In the Chinese civilisation, at least for the last 2,400 years, there is no such conflict. That, I say, is the one great fundamental difference between the Chinese civilisation and the civilization of modern Europe.

In other words, what I want to say, is that in modern Europe, the people have a religion which satisfies their heart, but not their head, and a philosophy which satisfies their head but not their heart. Now let us look at China. Some people say that the Chinese have no religion. It is certainly true that in China even the mass of the people do not take seriously to religion. I mean religion in the European sense of the word. The temples, rites and

ceremonies of Taoism and Buddhism in China are more objects of recreation than of edification; they touch the aesthetic sense, so to speak, of the Chinese people rather than their moral or religious sense; in fact, they appeal more to their imagination than to their heart or soul. But instead of saying that the Chinese have no religion, it is perhaps more correct to say that the Chinese do not want—do not *feel the need of religion*.

Now what is the explanation of this extraordinary fact that the Chinese people, even the mass of the population in China, do not feel the need of religion? It is thus given by an Englishman. Sir Robert K. Douglas, Professor of Chinese in the London University, in his study of Confucianism, says:—"Upwards of forty generations of Chinamen have been absolutely subjected to the dicta of one man. Being a Chinaman of Chinamen the teachings of Confucius were specially suited to the nature of those he taught. *The Mongolian mind being eminently phlegmatic and unspeculative*, naturally rebels against the idea of investigating matters beyond its experiences. With the idea of a future life still unawakened, a plain, matter-of-fact system of morality, such as that enunciated by Confucius, was sufficient for all the wants of the Chinese."

That learned English professor is right, when he says that the Chinese people do not feel the need of religion, because they have the teachings of Confucius, but he is altogether wrong, when he asserts that the Chinese people do not feel the need of religion because the Mongolian mind is phlegmatic and unspeculative. In the first place religion

is not a matter of speculation. Religion is a matter of feeling, of emotion; it is something which has to do with the human soul. The wild, savage man of Africa even, as soon as he emerges from a mere animal life and what is called the soul in him, is awakened,—feels the need of religion. Therefore although the Mongolian mind may be phlegmatic and unspeculative, the Mongolian Chinaman, who, I think it must be admitted, is a higher type of man than the wild man of Africa also has a soul, and, having a soul, must feel the need of religion unless he has something which can take for him the place of religion.

The truth of the matter is,—the reason why the Chinese people do not feel the need of religion is because they have in Confucianism a system of philosophy and ethics, a synthesis of human society and civilisation which can take the place of religion. People say that Confucianism is not a religion. It is perfectly true that Confucianism is not a religion in the ordinary European sense of the word. But then I say the greatness of Confucianism lies even in *this*, that it is *not* a religion. In fact, the greatness of Confucianism is that, without being a religion, it can take the place of religion; it can make men do without religion.

Now in order to understand how Confucianism can take the place of religion we must try and find out the reason why mankind, it seems to me, feel the need of religion. Mankind, it seems to me, feel the need of religion for the same reason that they feel the need of science, of art and of philosophy. The reason is because.

man is a being who has a soul. Now let us take science, I mean physical-science. What is the reason which makes men take up the study of science? Most people now think that men do so, because they want to have railways and aeroplanes. But the motive which impels the true men of science to pursue its study is not because they want to have railways and aeroplanes. Men like the present progressive Chinamen, who take up the study of science, because they want railways and aeroplanes, will never get science. The true men of science in Europe in the past who have worked for the advancement of science and brought about the possibility of building railways and aeroplanes, did not think at all of railways and aeroplanes. What impelled those true men of science in Europe and what made them succeed in their work for the advancement of science, was because they *felt in their souls* the need of understanding the awful mystery of the wonderful universe in which we live. Thus mankind, I say, feel the need of religion for the same reason that they feel the need of science, art and philosophy; and the reason is because man is a being who has a soul, and because the soul in him, which looks into the past and future as well as the present—not like animals which live only in the present—feels the need of understanding the mystery of this universe in which they live. Until men understand something of the nature, law, purpose and aim of the things which they see in the universe, they are like children in a dark room who feel the danger, insecurity and uncertainty of everything. In fact, as an English poet says, the burden of the mystery of

universe weighs upon them. Therefore mankind want science, art and philosophy for the same reason that they want religion, to lighten for them "the burden of the mystery,

The heavy and the weary weight of

- All this unintelligible world."

Art and poetry enable the artist and poet to see beauty and order in the universe and that lightens for them the burden of this mystery. Therefore a poet like Goethe, who says: "He who has art, has religion," does not feel the need of religion. Philosophy also enables the philosophers to see method and order in the universe, and that lightens for them the burden of this mystery. Therefore philosophers, like Spinoza, "for whom," it has been said, "the crown of the intellectual life is a transport, as for the saint the crown of the religious life is a transport," do not feel the need of religion. Lastly, science also enables the scientific men to see law and order in the universe, and that lightens for them the burden of this mystery. Therefore scientific men like Darwin and Professor Haeckel do not feel the need of religion.

But for the mass of mankind who are not poets, artists, philosophers or men of science; for the mass of mankind whose lives are full of hardships and who are exposed every moment to the shock of accident from the threatening forces of Nature and the cruel merciless passions of their fellow-men, what is it that can lighten for them the "burden of the mystery of all this unintelligible world?" It is religion. But how does religion lighten for the mass of mankind the

burden of this mystery? Religion, I say, lightens this burden by giving the mass of mankind a sense of *security* and a sense of *permanence*. In presence of the threatening forces of Nature and the cruel merciless passions of their fellow-men and the mystery and terror which these inspire, religion gives to the mass of mankind a refuge—a refuge in which they can find a sense of *security*, and that refuge is a belief in some supernatural Being or beings who have absolute power and control over those forces which threaten them. Again, in presence of the constant change, vicissitude and transition of things in their own lives—birth, childhood, youth, old age and death, and the mystery and uncertainty which these inspire, religion gives to the mass of mankind also a refuge—a refuge in which they can find a sense of *permanence*; and that refuge is the belief in a future life. In this way, I say, religion lightens for the mass of of mankind who are not poets, artists, philosophers or scientific men, the burden of the mystery of all this unintelligible world, by giving them a sense of security and a sense of permanence in their existence. Christ said: “Peace I give unto you, peace which the world cannot give and which the world cannot take away from you.” That is what I mean when I say that religion gives to the mass of mankind a sense of security and a sense of permanence. Therefore, unless you can find something which can give to the mass of mankind the same peace, the same sense of security and of permanence which religion affords them, the mass of mankind will always feel the need of religion.

But I said Confucianism, without being a religion can take the place of religion. Therefore, there must be something in Confucianism which can give to the mass of mankind the same sense of security and permanence which religion affords them. Let us now find out what this something is in Confucianism which can give the same sense of security and sense of permanence that religion gives.

I have often been asked to say what Confucius has done for the Chinese nation. Now I can tell you of many things which I think Confucius has accomplished for the Chinese people. But, as to-day I have not the time, I will only here try to tell you of one principal and most important thing which Confucius has done for the Chinese nation—the one thing he did in his life by which, Confucius himself said, men in after ages would know him, would know what he had done for them. When I have explained to you this one principal thing, you will then understand what that something is in Confucianism which can give to the mass of mankind the same sense of security and sense of permanence which religion affords them. In order to explain this, I must ask you to allow me to go a little more into detail about Confucius and what he did.

Confucius, as some of you may know, lived in what is called a period of expansion in the history of China—a period in which the feudal age had come to an end; in which the feudal, the semi-patriarchal social order and form of government had to be expanded and reconstructed. This great change necessarily brought with it not only

confusion in the affairs of the world, but also confusion in men's minds. I have said that in the Chinese civilization of the last 2,500 years there is no conflict between the heart and the head. But I must now tell you that in the period, expansion in which Confucius lived there was also in China, as now in Europe, a fearful conflict between the heart and the head. The Chinese people in Confucius's time found themselves with an immense system of institutions, established facts, accredited dogmas, customs, laws—in fact, an immense system of society and civilization which had come down to them from their venerated ancestors. In this system their life had to be carried forward; yet they began to feel—they had a sense that this system was not of their creation, that it by no means corresponded with the wants of their actual life; that, for them, it was customary, not rational. Now the awakening of this sense in the Chinese people 2,500 years ago was the awakening of what in Europe to-day is called the modern spirit—the spirit of liberalism, the spirit of enquiry, to find out the why and the wherefore of things. This modern spirit in China then, seeing the want of correspondence of the old order of society and civilisation with the wants of their actual life set itself not only to reconstruct a new order of society and civilisation, but also to find a basis for this new order of society and civilisation. But all the attempts to find a new basis for society and civilisation in China then failed. Some, while they satisfied the head—the intellect of the Chinese people, did not satisfy their heart; others, while they satisfied their heart, did not

satisfy their head. Hence arose, as I said, this conflict between the heart and the head in China 2,500 years ago, as we see it now in Europe. This conflict of the heart and head in the new order of society and civilisation which men tried to reconstruct made the Chinese people feel dissatisfied with all civilisation, and in the agony and despair which this dissatisfaction produced, the Chinese people wanted to pull down and destroy all civilisation. Men, like Laotzu, then in China as men like Tolstoi in Europe to-day, seeing the misery and suffering resulting from the conflict between the heart and the head, thought they saw something radically wrong in the very nature and constitution of society and civilisation. Laotzu and Chuang-tzu, the most brilliant of Laotzu's disciples, told the Chinese people to throw away all civilisation. Laotzu said to the people of China: "Leave all that you have and follow me; follow me to the mountains, to the hermit's cell in the mountains, there to live a true life—a life of the heart, a life of immortality."

But Confucius, who also saw the suffering and misery of the then state of society and civilisation, thought he recognised the evil was not in the nature and constitution of society and civilisation, but in the wrong track which society and civilisation had taken, in the wrong basis which men had taken for the foundation of society and civilisation. Confucius told the Chinese people not to throw away their civilisation. Confucius told them that in a true society and true civilisation—in a society and civilisation with a *true* basis men also could live a true life, a life of the

heart. In fact, Confucius tried hard all his life to put society and civilisation on the right track; to give it a true basis, and thus prevent the destruction of civilisation. But in the last days of his life, when Confucius saw that he could not prevent the destruction of the Chinese civilisation—what did he do? Well, as an architect who sees his house on fire, burning and falling over his head, and is convinced that he cannot possibly save the building, knows that the only thing for him to do is to save the drawings and plans of the building so that it may afterwards be built again; so Confucius, seeing the inevitable destruction of the building of the Chinese civilisation which he could not prevent, thought he would save the drawings and plans, and he accordingly saved the drawings and plans of the Chinese civilisation, which are now preserved in the Old Testament of the Chinese Bible—the five Canonical Books known as the *H'u Ching*, five canons. That, I say, was a great service which Confucius has done for the Chinese nation—he saved the drawings and plans of their civilisation for them.

Confucius, I say, when he saved the drawings and plans of the Chinese civilisation, did a great service for the Chinese nation. But that is not the principal, the greatest service which Confucius has done for the Chinese nation. The greatest service he did was that, in saving the drawings and plans of their civilisation, he made a new synthesis, a new interpretation of the plans of that civilisation, and in that new synthesis he gave the Chinese people the true idea

of a State—a true, rational, permanent, absolute basis of a State.

But then Plato and Aristotle in ancient times, and Rousseau and Herbert Spencer in modern times also made a synthesis of civilisation, and tried to give a true idea of a State. Now what is the difference between the philosophy, the synthesis of civilisation made by the great men of Europe I have mentioned, and the synthesis of civilisation—the system of philosophy and morality now known as Confucianism? The difference, it seems to me, is this. The philosophy of Plato and Aristotle and of Herbert Spencer has not become a religion or the equivalent of a religion, the accepted faith of the masses of a people or nation, whereas Confucianism has become a religion or the equivalent of a religion to even the mass of the population in China. When I say religion here, I mean religion, not in the narrow European sense of the word, but in the broad universal sense. Goethe say:—“*Nur sacmtliche Menschen erkennen die Natur; nur sacmtliche Menschen leben das Menschliche.*” Only the mass of mankind know what is real life; only the mass of mankind live a true human life.” Now when we speak of religion in its broad universal sense, we mean generally a system of teaching with rules of conduct which, as Goethe says, is accepted as true and binding by the mass of mankind, or at least, by the mass of population in a people or nation. In this broad and universal sense of the word Christianity and Buddhism are religions. In this broad and universal sense, Confucianism, as you know, has become a religion, as its teachings

have been acknowledged to be true and its rules of conduct to be binding by the whole Chinese race and nation, whereas the philosophy of Plato, of Aristotle and of Herbert Spencer has not become a religion even in this broad universal sense. That, I say, is the difference between Confucianism and the philosophy of Plato and Aristotle and of Herbert Spencer—the one has remained a philosophy for the learned, whereas the other has become a religion or the equivalent of a religion for the mass of the whole Chinese nation as well as for the learned of China.

In this broad universal sense of the word, I say Confucianism is a religion just as Christianity or Buddhism is a religion. But you will remember I say that Confucianism is not a religion in the European sense of the word. What is then the difference between Confucianism and a religion in the European sense of the word? There is, of course, the difference that the one has a supernatural origin and element in it, whereas the other has not. But besides this difference of supernatural and non-supernatural, there is also another difference between Confucianism and a religion in the European sense of the word such as Christianity and Buddhism, and it is this. A religion in the European sense of the word teaches a man to be a good *man*. But Confucianism does more than this; Confucianism teaches a man to be a good *citizen*. The Christian Catechism asks:—"What is the chief end of *man*?" But the Confucian Catechism asks:—"What is the chief end of a *citizen*?" of man, not in his individual life, but man in his relation with his fellowmen and in his relation to the State. The

Christian answers the words of his Catechism by saying: "The chief end of man is to glorify God." The Confucianist answers the words of his Catechism by saying: "The chief end of man is to live as a *dutiful son* and a *good citizen*." Tzü Yu, a disciple of Confucius, is quoted in the *Sayings and Discourses of Confucius*, saying: "A wise man devotes his attention to the foundation of life—the chief end of man. When the foundation is laid, wisdom, religion will come. Now to live as a dutiful son and good citizen, is not that the foundation—the chief end of man as a moral being?" In short, a religion in the European sense of the word makes in its object to transform man into a perfect ideal man by himself, into a saint, a Buddha, an angel, whereas Confucianism limits itself to make man into a good citizen—to live as a dutiful son and a good citizen. In other words, a religion in the European sense of the word says:—"If you want to have religion, you must be a saint, a Buddha, an angel;" whereas Confucianism says:—"If you live as a dutiful son and a good citizen, you *have* religion."

In fact, the real difference between Confucianism and religion in the European sense of the word, such as Christianity or Buddhism, is that the one is a personal religion, or what may be called a Church religion, whereas the other is a social religion, or what may be called a State religion. The greatest service, I say, which Confucius has done for the Chinese nation, is that he gave them a true idea of a State. Now in giving this true idea of a State, Confucius made that idea a religion. In Europe politics is a science,

but in China, since, Confucius' time, politics is a religion. In short, the greatest service which Confucius has done for the Chinese nation, I say, is that he gave them a Social or State religion. Confucius taught this State religion in a book which he wrote in the very last days of his life, a book to which he gave the name of *Ch'un Ch'iu* (春秋) Spring and Autumn. Confucius gave the name of Spring and Autumn to this book because the object of the book is to give the real moral causes which govern the rise and fall—the Spring and Autumn of nations. The book might also be called the Latter Day Annals, like the Latter Day Pamphlets of Carlyle. In this book Confucius gave a résumé of the history of a false and decadent state of society and civilisation in which he traced all the suffering and misery of that false and decadent state of society and civilisation to its real cause—to the fact that men had not a true idea of a State; no right conception of the true nature of the duty which they owe to the State, to the head of the State, their ruler and Sovereign. In a way Confucius in this book taught the *divine right of kings*. Now I know all of you, or at least most of you, do you now believe in the divine right of kings. I will not argue the point with you here. I will only ask you to suspend your judgment until you have heard what I have further to say. In the meantime I will just ask your permission to quote to you here a saying of Carlyle. Carlyle says: "The right of a king to govern us is either a divine right or a diabolic wrong." Now I want you, on this subject of the divine right of kings, to remember and ponder over this saying of Carlyle.

In this book Confucius taught that, as in all the ordinary relations and dealings between men in human society, there is, besides the base motives of interest and of fear, a higher and nobler motive to influence them in their conduct, a higher and nobler motive which rises above all considerations of interest and fear, the motive called *Duty*; so in this important relation of all in human society, the relation between the people of a State or nation and the Head of that State or nation, there is also this higher and nobler motive of Duty which should influence and inspire them in their conduct. But what is the rational basis of this duty which the people in a State or nation owe to the head of the State or nation? Now in the feudal age before Confucius' time, with its semi-patriarchal order of Society and form of Government, when the State was more or less a family, the people did not feel so much the need of having a clear and firm basis for the duty which they owe to the Head of the State, because, as they were all members of one clan or family, the tie of kinship or natural affection already, in a way, bound them to the Head of the State, who was also the senior member of their clan or family. But in Confucius' time the feudal age, as I said, had come to an end; when the State had outgrown the family, when the citizens of a State were no longer composed of the members of a clan or family. It was, therefore, then necessary to find a new, clear, rational and firm basis for the duty which the people in a State or nation owe to the Head of the State—their ruler and sovereign. Now what

new basis did Confucius find for this duty? Confucius found the new basis for this duty in the word *Honour*.

When I was in Japan last year the ex-Minister of Education, Baron Kikuchi, asked me to translate four Chinese characters taken from the book in which, as I said, Confucius taught this State religion of his. The four characters were *Ming fen ta yi*. (名分大義) I translated them as the Great Principle of Honour and duty. It is for this reason that the Chinese make a special distinction between Confucianism and all other religions by calling the system of teaching taught by Confucius not a *chiao* (教)—the general term in Chinese for religion with which they designate other religions, such as Buddhism, Mohammedanism and Christianity—but the *ming chiao* (名教)—the religion of Honour. Again the term *chun tzu chih tao* (君子之道) in the teachings of Confucius, translated by Dr. Legge as “the way of the superior man,” for which the nearest equivalent in the European languages is moral law—means literally, the way—the *Law of the Gentleman*. In fact, the whole system of philosophy and morality taught by Confucius may be summed up in one word: the Law of the Gentleman. Now Confucius codified this law of the gentleman and made it a Religion,—a State religion. The first Article of Faith in this State Religion is *Ming fen ta yi*—the Principle of Honour and Duty—which may thus be called: The Great Code of Honour.

In this State religion Confucius taught that the only true, rational, permanent and absolute basis, not only of a State, but of all Society and civilisation, is this law of the

gentleman, the sense of honour in man. Now you, all of you, even those who believe that there is no morality in politics—all of you, I think, know and will admit the importance of this sense of honour in men in human society. But I am not quite sure that all of you are aware of the *absolute* necessity of this sense of honour in men for the carrying on of every form of human society; in fact, as the proverb which says: “There must be honour even among thieves,”—even for the carrying on of a society of thieves. Without the sense of honour in men, all society and civilisation would on the instant break down and become impossible. Will you allow me to show you how this is so? Let us take, for example, such a trivial matter as gambling in social life. Now unless men when they sit down to gamble all recognise and feel themselves bound by the sense of honour to pay when a certain colour of cards or dice turns up, gambling would on the instant become impossible. The merchants again—unless merchants recognise and feel themselves bound by the sense of honour to fulfil their contracts, all trading would become impossible. But you will say that the merchant who repudiates his contract can be taken to the law-court. True, but if there were no law-courts, what then? Besides, the law-court—how can the law-court make the defaulting merchant fulfil his contract? By force. In fact, without the sense of honour in men, society can only be held together for a time by force. But then I think I can show you that force alone cannot hold society permanently together. The policeman who compels the merchant to fulfill

his contract, uses force. But the lawyer, magistrate or president of a republic—how does he make the policeman do his duty? You know he cannot do it by force: but then by what? Either by the sense of honour in the policemen or by *fraud*.

In modern times all over the world to-day—and I am sorry to say now also in China—the lawyer, politician, magistrate and president of a republic make the policeman do his duty by fraud. In modern times the lawyer, politician, magistrate and president of a republic tell the policeman that he must do his duty, because it is for the good of society and for the good of his country; and that the good of society means that he, the policeman can get his pay regularly, without which he and his family would die of starvation. The lawyer, politician or president of a republic who tells the policemen this, I say, uses *fraud*. I say it is fraud, because the good of the country, which for the policemen means fifteen shillings a week, which barely keeps him and his family from starvation, means for the lawyer, politician, magistrate and president of a republic ten to twenty thousand pounds a year, with a fine house, electric light, motor cars and all the comforts and luxuries which the life blood labour of ten thousands of men has to supply him. I say it is fraud because without the recognition of a sense of honour—the sense of honour which makes the gambler pay the last penny in his pocket to the player who wins from him, *without this sense of honour*, all transfer and possession of property which makes the inequality of the rich and poor in society, as well as the

transfer of money on a gambling table, has no justification whatever and no binding force. Thus the lawyer, politician, magistrate or president of a republic, although they talk of the good of society and the good of the country, really depend upon the policeman's unconscious sense of honour which not only makes him do his duty, but also **makes** him respect the right of property and be satisfied with fifteen shillings a week, while the lawyer, politician and president of a republic receive an income of twenty thousand pounds a year. I, therefore, say it is fraud because while they thus demand the sense of honour from the policeman; they, the lawyer, politician, magistrate and president of a republic in modern society believe, openly say and act on the principle that there is no morality, no sense of honour in politics.

You will remember what Carlyle, I told you, said—that the right of a king to govern us is either a divine right or a diabolic wrong. Now this fraud of the modern lawyer, politician, magistrate and president of a republic is what Carlyle calls a diabolic wrong. It is this fraud, this Jesuitism of the public men in modern society, who say and act on the principle that there is no morality, no sense of honour in politics and yet plausibly talk of the good of society and the good of the country; it is this Jesuitism which, as Carlyle says, gives rise to “the widespread suffering, mutiny, delirium, the hot rage of sansculottic insurrections, the cold rage of resuscitated tyrannies, brutal degradation of the millions, the pampered frivolity of the units” which we see in modern society to-day. In short, it

is this combination of fraud and force, Jesuitism and Militarism, lawyer and policeman, which has produced Anarchists and Anarchism in modern society, this combination of force and fraud outraging the moral sense in man and producing madness which makes the Anarchist throw bomb and dynamite against the lawyer, politician, magistrate and president of a republic.

In fact, a society without the sense of honour in men, and without morality in its politics, cannot, I say, be held together, or at any rate, cannot last. For in such a society the policeman, upon whom the lawyer, politician, magistrate and president of a republic depend to carry out their fraud, will thus argue with himself. He is told that he must do his duty for the good of society. But he, the poor policeman, is also a part of that society—to himself and his family, at least, the most important part of that society. Now if by some other way than by being a policeman, perhaps by being an anti-policeman, he can get better pay to improve the condition of himself and his family, that also means the good of society. In that way the policeman must sooner or later come to the conclusion that, as there is no such thing as a sense of honour and morality in politics, there is then no earthly reason why, if he can get better pay, which means also the good of society—no reason why, instead of being a policeman, he should not become a revolutionist or anarchist. In a society when the policeman once comes to the conclusion that there is no reason why, if he can get better pay, he should not become a revolutionist or anarchist—that society is doomed. Mencius said:—

“When Confucius completed his Spring and Autumn Annals”—the book in which he taught the State religion of his and in which he showed that the society of his time—in which there was then, as in the world to-day, no sense of honour in public men and no morality in politics—was doomed; when Confucius wrote that book, “the Jesuits and anarchists (lit. bandits) of his time, became afraid.” (亂臣賊子懼)*

But the return from the digression. I say, a society without the sense of honour cannot be held together, cannot last. For if, as we have seen, even in the relation between men connected with matters of little or no vital importance such as gambling and trading in human society, the recognition of the sense of honour is so important and necessary, how much more so it must be in the relations between men in human society, which establish the two most essential institutions in that society, the Family and the State. Now, as you all know, the rise of civil society in the history of all nations begins always with the institution of marriage. The Church religion in Europe makes marriage a *sacrament*, i.e., something sacred and inviolable. The sanction for the sacrament of marriage in Europe is given by the Church and the authority for the sanction is God. But that is only an outward, formal, or so to speak, legal sanction. The true, inner, the really binding sanction for the inviolability of marriage—as we see it in countries where there is no church religion, is the

*Mencius Bk. III, Part II IX, 11.

sense of honour, the law of the gentleman in the man and woman. Confucius says, "The recognition of the law of the gentleman begins with the recognition of the relation between husband and wife." *In other words, the recognition of the sense of honour—the law of the gentleman—in all countries where there is civil society, establishes the institution of marriage, The institution of marriage establishes the *Family*.

I said that the State religion which Confucius taught is a Code of Honour, and I told you that Confucius made this Code out of the law of the gentleman. But now I must tell you that long before Confucius' time there existed undefined and unwritten code of the law of the gentleman known as *li* (禮) the law of propriety, good taste or good manners. Later on in history before Confucius' time a great statesman arose in China—the man known as the great Law-giver of China, generally spoken of as the Duke of Chou (周公) (B. C. 1135)—who first defined, fixed, and made a written code of the law of the gentleman, known then in China as *li*, the law of propriety, good taste or good manners. This first written code of the gentleman in China,, made by the Duke of Chou, became known as *Chou li*—the laws of good manners of the Duke of Chou. This Code of the laws of good manners of the Duke of Chou may be considered as the pre-Confucian religion in China, or, as the Mosaic law of the Jewish nation before

Christianity is called, the Religion of the Old Dispensation of the Chinese people. It was this religion of the old dispensation—the first written code of the law of the gentleman called the Law of good manners of the Duke of Chou—which first gave the sanction for the sacrament and inviolability of marriage in China. The Chinese to this day therefore speak of the sacrament of marriage as *Chou Kung Chih Li* (周公之禮)—the law of good manners of the Duke of Chou. By the institution of the sacrament of marriage, the pre-Confucian or Religion of the old Dispensation in China established the Family. It secured once for all the stability and permanence of the family in China. This pre-Confucian or Religion of the Old Dispensation known as the law of good manners of the Duke of Chou in China might thus be called a *Family* religion as distinguished from the *State* religion which Confucius afterwards taught.

Now Confucius in the State religion which he taught, gave a new Dispensation, so to speak, to what I have called the Family religion which existed before his time. In other words, Confucius gave a new, wider and more comprehensive application to the law of the gentleman in the State religion which he taught; and as the Family religion, or Religion of the Old Dispensation in China before his time instituted the sacrament of marriage, so Confucius, in giving this new, wider, and more comprehensive application to the law of the gentleman in the State religion which he taught, instituted a new

sacrament. This new sacrament which Confucius instituted, instead of calling it *li*—the Law of good manners, he called it *ming fen ta yi*, which I have translated as the Great Principle of Honour and Duty or Code of Honour. By the institution of this *ming fen ta yi* or Code of Honour Confucius gave the Chinese people, instead of a Family religion, which they had before—a State religion.

Confucius, in the State religion which he now gave, taught that, as under the old dispensation, the Family religion the wife and husband in a family are bound by the sacrament of marriage,—to hold their contract of marriage inviolable, so under the new dispensation of the State religion which he now gave, the Chinese people and their Emperor in China, are bound by this new sacrament called *ming fen ta yi*—the Great Principle of Honour and Duty or Code of Honour—to hold the contract of allegiance between them as something sacred and inviolable. In short, this new sacrament called *ming fen ta yi*, or Code of Honour which Confucius instituted, is a *Sacrament of Allegiance*, as the old sacrament called *Chou Kung Chih Li*, the Law of Good Manners of the Duke of Chou is a sacrament of marriage. In this way Confucius, as I said, gave a new, wider, and more comprehensive application to the law of the gentleman, and thus gave a new dispensation to what I have called the Family religion in China before his time, and made it a State religion,

In other words, this State religion of Confucius makes a sacrament of the contract of allegiance as the Family Religion in China before his time, makes a sacrament of the contract of marriage. As by the sacrament of marriage established by the Family Religion the wife is bound to be absolutely loyal to her husband, so by this sacrament of the contract of allegiance called *ming fen ta yi*, or Code of Honour established by the State religion taught by Confucius in China, the people of China are bound to be absolutely loyal to the Emperor. This sacrament of the contract of allegiance in the State religion taught by Confucius in China might thus be called the *Sacrament or Religion of Loyalty*. You will remember what I said to you that Confucius in a way taught the Divine right of kings. But instead of saying that Confucius taught the Divine right of kings I should properly have said that Confucius taught the *Divine duty of Loyalty*. This Divine or absolute duty of loyalty to the Emperor in China which Confucius taught derives its sanction, not as the theory of the Divine right of kings in Europe derives its sanction from the authority of a supernatural Being called God or from some abstruse philosophy, but from the law of the gentleman—the sense of honour in man, the same sense of honour which in all countries makes the wife loyal to her husband. In fact, the absolute duty of loyalty of the Chinese people to the Emperor which Confucius taught, derives its sanction from the same simple sense of honour which makes the merchant keep his word and fulfil his

contract, and the gambler play the game and pay his gambling debt.

Now, as what I have called the Family religion, the religion of the old dispensation in China and the Church religion in all countries, by the institution of the sacrament and inviolability of marriage establishes the Family, so what I have called the State religion in China which Confucius taught, by the institution of this new sacrament of the contract of allegiance, establishes the State. If you will consider what a great service the man who first instituted the sacrament and established the inviolability of marriage in the world has done for humanity and the cause of civilisation, you will then, I think, understand what a great work this is which Confucius did when he instituted this new sacrament and established the inviolability of the contract of allegiance. The institution of the sacrament of marriage secures the stability and permanence of the Family, without which the human race would become extinct. The institution of this sacrament of the contract of allegiance secure the stability and permanence of the State, without which human society and civilisation would all be destroyed and mankind would return to the state of savages or animals. I therefore said to you that the greatest thing which Confucius has done for the Chinese people is that he gave them the true idea of a State—a true, rational, permanent, and absolute basis of a

State, and in giving them that, he made it a religion,—a State religion.

Confucius taught this State religion in a book which, as I told you, he wrote in the very last days of his life, a book to which he gave the name of Spring and Autumn. In this book Confucius first instituted the new sacrament of the contract of allegiance called *ming fen ta yi*, or the Code of Honour. This sacrament is therefore often and generally spoken of as *Chun Chiu ming fen ta yi*. (春秋名分大義) or simply *Chun Chiu ta yi* — (春秋大義) *i.e.*, the Great Principle of Honour and Duty of the Spring and Autumn Annals, or simply the Great Code of the Spring and Autumn Annals. This book in which Confucius taught the Divine duty of loyalty is the *Magna Charta* of the Chinese nation. It contains the sacred covenant, the sacred social contract by which Confucius bound the whole Chinese people and nation to be absolutely loyal to the Emperor, and this covenant or sacrament, this Code of Honour, is the one and only true Constitution not only of the State and Government in China, but also of the Chinese civilisation. Confucius said it was by this book that after ages would know him—know what he had done for the world.

I am afraid I have exhausted your patience in taking such a very long way to the point of what I want to say. But now we have got to the point where I last left you. You will remember I said that the reason why the mass of mankind will always feel the need of religion—I mean religion in the European sense of the word—is because

religion gives them a refuge, the belief in an all powerful Being called God in which they can find a sense of security and the sense of permanence in their existence. But I said that the system of philosophy and morality which Confucius taught, known as Confucianism, can take the place of religion, can make men, even the mass of mankind do without religion. Therefore, there must be, I said, something in Confucianism which can give to men, to the mass of mankind, the same sense of security and sense of permanence which religion gives. Now, I think we have found this something. This something is the *Divine duty of loyalty to the Emperor* taught by Confucius in the State religion which he has given to the Chinese nation.

Now, this absolute Divine duty of loyalty to the Emperor of every man, woman, and child in the whole Chinese Empire gives, as you can understand, in the minds of the Chinese population, an absolute, transcendent, almighty power to the Emperor; and this belief in the absolute, transcendent, almighty power of the Emperor it is which gives to the Chinese people, to the mass of the population in China, the same sense of security which the belief in God in religion gives to the mass of mankind in other countries. The belief in the absolute, transcendent, almighty power of the Emperor also secures in the minds of the Chinese population the absolute stability and permanence of the State. This absolute stability and permanence of the State again secures the infinite continuance and lastingness of society. This infinite continuance and lastingness of society finally

secures in the minds of the Chinese population the immortality of the race. Thus it is this belief in the immortality of the race, derived from the belief in the almighty power of the Emperor given to him by the Divine duty of loyalty, which gives to the Chinese people, the mass of the population in China, the same sense of permanence in their existence which the belief in a future life of religion gives to the mass of mankind in other countries.

Again, as the absolute Divine duty of loyalty taught by Confucius secures the immortality of the race in the nation, so the cult of ancestor-worship taught in Confucianism secures the immortality of the race in the family. Indeed, the cult of ancestor-worship in China is not founded so much on the belief in a future life as in the belief of the immortality of the race. A Chinese, when he dies, is not consoled by the belief that he will live a life hereafter, but by the belief that his children, grandchildren, great-grand-children, all those dearest to him, will *remember him, think of him, love him, to the end of time*, and in that way, in his imagination, dying, to a Chinese, is like going on a long, long journey, if not with the hope, at least with a great "perhaps" of meeting again. Thus this cult of ancestor-worship, together with the Divine duty of loyalty, in Confucianism gives to the Chinese people the same sense of permanence in their existence while they live and the same consolation when they die which the belief in a future life in religion gives to the mass of mankind in other countries. It is for his reason

that the Chinese people attach the same importance to this cult of ancestor-worship as they do to the principle of the Divine duty of loyalty to the Emperor. Mencius said: "Of the three great sins against filial piety the greatest is to have no posterity." Thus the whole system of teaching of Confucius which I have called the State religion in China consists really only of two things, loyalty to the Emperor and filial piety to parents—in Chinese, *Chung Hsiao*. (忠孝) In fact, the three Articles of Faith, called in Chinese the *san kang*. (三綱) three cardinal duties in Confucianism or the State religion of China, are, in their order of importance—first, absolute duty of loyalty to the Emperor; second, filial piety and ancestor-worship; third inviolability of marriage and absolute submission of the wife to the husband. The last two of the three Articles were already in what I have called the Family religion, or religion of the old dispensation in China before Confucius' time; but the first Article—absolute duty of loyalty to the Emperor—was first taught by Confucius and laid down by him in the State religion or religion of the new dispensation which he gave to the Chinese nation. This first Article of Faith—absolute duty of loyalty to the Emperor—in Confucianism takes the place and is the equivalent of the First Article of Faith in all religions—the belief in God. It is because Confucianism has this equivalent for the belief in God of religion that Confucianism, as I have shown you, can take the place of religion, and the Chinese people, even the mass of the population in China, do not feel the need of religion.

But now you will ask me how without a belief in God which religion teaches, how can one make men, make the mass of mankind, follow and obey the moral rule which Confucius teaches, the absolute duty of loyalty to the Emperor, as you can by the authority of God which the belief in God gives, make men follow and obey moral rules given by religion? Before I answer your question, will you allow me first to point out to you a great mistake which people make in believing that it is the sanction given by the authority of God which makes men obey the rules of moral conduct. I told you that the sanction for the sacrament and inviolability of marriage in Europe is given by the Church, and the authority for the sanction, the Church says, is from God. But I said that was only an outward formal sanction. The real true inner sanction for the inviolability of marriage, as we see it in all countries where there is no Church religion, is the sense of honour, the law of the gentleman in the man and woman. Thus the real authority for the obligation to obey rules of moral conduct is the *moral* sense, the law of the gentleman, in man. The belief in God is, therefore, not necessary to make men obey rules of moral conduct.

It is this fact which has made sceptics like Voltaire and Tom Paine in the last century, and rationalists like Sir Hiram Maxim to-day, say, that the belief in God is a fraud or imposture invented by the founders of religion and kept up by priests. But that is a gross and preposterous libel. All great men, all men with great intellect, have all always believed in God. Confucius also

believed in God, although he seldom spoke of it. Even Napoleon with his great, practical intellect believed in God. As the Psalmist says: "Only the fool—the man with a vulgar and shallow intellect—has said in his heart, 'There is no God.'" But the belief in God of men of great intellect is different from the belief in God of the mass of mankind. The belief in God of men of great intellect is that of Spinoza: a belief in the Divine Order of the Universe. Confucius said: "At fifty I knew the Ordinance of God" *—*i.e.*, the Divine Order of the Universe. Men of great intellect have given different names to this Divine Order of the Universe. The German Fichte calls it the Divine idea of the Universe. In philosophical language in China it is called *Tao*—the Way. But whatever name men of great intellect may give to this Divine Order of the Universe, it is the knowledge of this Divine Order of the Universe which makes men of great intellect see the *absolute* necessity of obeying rules of moral conduct or moral laws which form part of that Divine Order of the Universe.

Thus, although the belief in God is not necessary to make men obey the rules of moral conduct, yet the belief in God is necessary to make men see the *absolute* necessity of obeying these rules. It is the knowledge of the absolute necessity of obeying the rules of moral conduct which enables and makes all men of great intellect follow and obey those rules. Confucius says: "A man without a

knowledge of the Ordinance of God, *i.e.*, the Divine Order of the Universe, cannot be a gentleman† But then, the mass of mankind, who have not great intellect, cannot follow the reasoning which leads men of great intellect to the knowledge of the Divine Order of the Universe and cannot therefore understand the absolute necessity of obeying moral laws. Indeed, as Matthew Arnold says: "Moral rules, apprehended as ideas first, and then rigorously followed as laws are and must be for the sage only. The mass of mankind have neither force of intellect enough to apprehend them as ideas nor force of character enough to follow them strictly as laws." It is for this reason that the philosophy and morality taught by Plato, Aristotle and Herbert Spencer have a value only for scholars.

But the value of religion is that it enables men, enables and can make even the mass of mankind who have not force of intellect nor force of character, to strictly follow and obey the rules of moral conduct. But then how and by what means does religion enable and make men do this? People imagine that religion enables and makes men obey the rules of moral conduct by teaching men the belief in God. But that, as I have shown you, is a great mistake. The one and sole authority which makes men really obey moral laws or rules of moral conduct is the moral sense, the law of the gentleman in them. Confucius said: "A moral law which is outside

† Discourses and Sayings Chap. XX 3.

of man is not a moral law." Even Christ in teaching His religion says: "The Kingdom of God is within you." I say, therefore, the idea which people have that religion makes men obey the rules of moral conduct by means of teaching them the belief in God is a mistake. Martin Luther says admirably in his commentary on the Book of Daniel: "A God is simply that whereon the human heart *rests* with trust, faith, hope and love. If the resting is right, then the God, too, is right; if the resting is wrong, then the God, too, is illusory." This belief in God taught by religion is, therefore, only a *resting*, or, as I call it, a refuge. Men rightly call this belief in God—in the Divine Order of the Universe taught by religion—a faith, a trust, or, as I called it, a refuge. Nevertheless, this refuge, the belief in God, taught by religion, although only a faith, a trust, helps towards enabling men to obey the rules of moral conduct, for, as I said, the belief in God gives to men, to the mass of mankind, a sense of security and a sense of permanence in their existence.

But if the belief in God taught by religion only helps to make men obey the rules of moral conduct, what is it then upon which Religion depends principally to make men, to make the mass of mankind, obey the rules of moral conduct? It is *inspiration*. Matthew Arnold truly says: "The noblest souls of whatever creed, the pagan Empedocles as well as the Christian Paul, have insisted on the necessity of inspiration, a living emotion to make moral actions perfect." Now what is this inspira-

tion or living emotion in Religion, the paramount virtue of Religion upon which, as I said, Religion principally depends to make men, to enable and make even the mass of mankind obey the rules of moral conduct or moral laws?

You will remembe I told you that the whole system of the teachings of Confucius may be summed up in one word: the Law of the Gentleman. Confucius calls this law of the gentleman a ssecret. Confucius says: "The law of the gentleman is to be found everywhere, and yet it is a secret." Nevertheless Confucius says: "The simple intelligence of ordinary men and women of the people even can know something of this secret. The ignoble nature of ordinary men and women of the people, too, can carry out this law of the gentleman." For this reason Goethe, who also knew this secret—the law of the gentleman of Confucius, called it an "open secret." Now where and how did mankind come to discover this secret? Confucius said, you will remember, I told you that the recognition of the law of the gentleman began with the recognition of the relation of husband and wife—the true relation between a man and woman in marriage. Thus the secret, the open secret of Goethe, the law of the gentleman of Confucius, was flrst discovered by a man and woman. But now, again, how did the man and the woman discover this secret—the law of the gentleman of Confucius?

I told you that the nearest equivalent in the European languages for the law of the gentleman of Confucius, is moral law. Now what is the difference between the law of the gentleman of Confucius and moral law—I mean the moral law or law of morality of the philosopher and moralist as distinguished from religion or law of morality taught by religious teachers. In order to understand this difference between the law of the gentleman of Confucius and the moral law of the philosopher and moralist, let us first find out the difference that there is between religion and the moral law of the philosopher and moralist.

The moral law of the philosopher tells us we must obey the law of our being called Reason. But Reason, as it is generally understood, means our reasoning power, that slow process of mind or intellect which enables us to distinguish and recognise the *definable* properties and qualities of the outward forms of things. Reason, our reasoning power, therefore, enables us to see in moral relations only the definable properties and qualities, the *mores*, the morality, as it is rightly called, the outward manner and dead form, the body, so to speak, of right and wrong, or justice. Reason, our reasoning power alone, cannot make us see the *undefinable*, living, absolute essence of right and wrong, or justice, the life or soul, so to speak, of justice. For this reason Laotzu says: "The moral law that can be expressed in language is not the absolute moral law. The moral idea that can be defined

† 道可道非常道名可名非常名

with words is not the absolute moral idea.”† The moral law of the moralist again tells us we must obey the law of our being, called Conscience, *i.e.*, our heart. But then, as the Wise Man in the Hebrew Bible says, there are many devices in a man’s heart. Therefore, when we take Conscience, our heart, as the law of our being and obey it, we are liable and apt to obey, not the voice of what I have called the soul of justice, the indefinable absolute essence of justice, but the many devices in a man’s heart.

In other words Religion tells us in obeying the law of our being we must obey the *true* law of our being, not the animal or carnal law of our being called by St. Paul the *law of the mind of the flesh*, and very well defined by the famous disciple of Auguste Comte, Monsieur Littré, as the law of self-preservation and reproduction; but the true law of our being called by St. Paul the *law of the mind, of the Spirit*, and defined by Confucius as the law of the gentleman. In short, this true law of our being, which Religion tells us to obey, is what Christ calls the Kingdom of God within us. Thus we see, as Confucius says, Religion is a spiritualized, a deeper law than the moral law of the philosopher and moralist. Therefore, Christ said: “Except your righteousness (or morality) exceed the righteousness (or morality) of the Scribes and Pharisees (*i.e.*, philosopher and moralist) ye shall in no wise enter into the Kingdom of Heaven.”

Now, like Religion, the law of the gentleman of Confucius is also—a deeper law than the moral law of the philosopher and moralist. The moral law of the

philosopher and moralist tells us we must obey the law of our being called by the philosopher, Reason, and by the moralist, Conscience. But, like Religion, the law of the gentleman of Confucius tells us we must obey the *true* law of our being, not the law of being of the average man in the street or of the vulgar and impure person, but the law of being of what Emerson calls "the simplest and purest minds" in the world. In fact, in order to know what the law of being of the gentleman is, we must first *be a gentleman* and have, in the words of Emerson, the simple and pure mind of the gentleman developed in him. For this reason Confucius says: "It is the man that can raise the standard of the moral law, and not the moral law that can raise the standard of the man."*

Nevertheless Confucius says we can know what the law of the gentleman is, if we will study and try to acquire the fine feeling or *good taste* of the gentleman. The word in Chinese *li* (禮) for good taste in the teaching of Confucius has been variously translated as ceremony, propriety, and good manners, but the word means really *good taste*. Now this good taste, the fine feeling and good taste of a gentleman, when applied to moral action, is what, in European language, is called the *sense of honour*. In fact, the law of the gentleman of Confucius is nothing else but the sense of honour. This sense of honour, called by Confucius the law of the gentleman, is not like the moral law of the philosopher and moralist, a dry, dead

knowledge of the form or formula of right and wrong, but like the Righteousness of the Bible in Christianity, an instinctive, living, vivid perception of the indefinable, absolute essence of right and wrong or justice, the life and soul of justice called honour.

Now, we can answer the question: How did the man and woman who first recognised the relation of husband and wife, discover the secret, the secret of Goethe, the law of the gentleman of Confucius? The man and woman who discovered this secret, discovered it because they had the fine feeling, the good taste of the gentleman, called when applied to moral action the sense of honour, which made them see the undefinable, absolute essence of right and wrong or justice, the life and soul of justice called Honour. But then what gave, what inspired the man and woman to have this fine feeling, this good taste or sense of honour which made them see the soul of justice called Honour? This beautiful sentence of Joubert will explain it. Joubert says: "*Les hommes ne sont justes qu'envers ceux qu'ils aiment. A man cannot be truly just to his neighbour unless he loves him.*" Therefore the inspiration which made the man and woman see what Joubert calls true justice, the soul of justice called Honour, and thus enable them to discover the secret—the open secret of Goethe, the law of the gentleman of Confucius—is *Love*—the love between the man and the woman, which gave birth, so to speak, to the law of the gentleman; that secret, the possession of which has enabled mankind not only to build up society and civilisation, but also to establish

religion—to find God. You can now understand Goethe's confession of faith which he puts into the mouth of Faust, beginning with the words:

Lifts not the Heaven its dome above?

Doth not the firm-set Earth beneath us lie? •

Now, I told you that it is not the belief in God taught by religion, which makes men obey the rules of moral conduct. What really makes men obey the rules of moral conduct is the law of the gentleman—the Kingdom of Heaven within us—to which religion appeals. Therefore the law of the gentleman is really the life of religion, whereas the belief in God together with the rules of moral conduct which religion teaches, is only the body, so to speak, of religion. But if the life of religion is the law of the gentleman, the *soul* of religion, the source of inspiration in religion,—is Love. This love does not merely mean the love between a man and a woman from whom mankind only first learn to know it. Love includes all true human affection, the feeling of affection between parents and children as well as the emotion of love and kindness, pity, compassion, mercy towards all creatures; in fact, all true human emotions contained in that Chinese word *Jen*, (仁) for which the nearest equivalent in the European languages is, in the old dialect of Christianity, godliness, because it is the most godlike quality in man, and in modern dialect, humanity, love of humanity, or, in one word, love. In short, the soul of religion, the source of inspiration in religion is this Chinese word *Jen*, love—or call it by what name you like—which first came into

the world as love between a man and a woman. This, then, is the inspiration in religion, the paramount virtue in religion, upon which religion, as I said, depends principally to make men, to enable and make even the mass of mankind obey the rules of moral conduct or moral laws which form part of the Divine Order of the universe. Confucius says: "The law of the gentleman begins with the recognition of husband and wife; but in its utmost reaches, it reigns and rules supreme over heaven and earth—the whole universe."

We have now found the inspiration, the living emotion that is in religion. But this inspiration or living emotion in religion is found not only in religion—I mean Church religion. This inspiration or living emotion is known to everyone who has ever felt an impulse which makes him obey the rules of moral conduct above all considerations of self-interest or fear. In fact, this inspiration or living emotion that is in religion is found in every action of men which is not prompted by the base motive of self-interest or fear, but by the sense of duty and honour. This inspiration or living emotion in religion, I say, is found not only in religion. But the value of religion is that the words of the rules of moral conduct which the founders of all great religions have left behind them have, what the rules of morality of philosophers and moralists have not, this inspiration or living emotion which, as Mathew Arnold says, *lights up* those rules and makes it easy for men to obey them. But this inspiration or living emotion in the words of the rules of conduct of

religion again is found not only in religion. All the words of really great men in literature, especially poets, have also this inspiration or living emotion that is in religion. The words of Goethe, for instance, which I have just quoted, have also this inspiration or living emotion. But the words of great men in literature, unfortunately, cannot reach the mass of mankind because all great men in literature speak the language of educated men, which the mass of mankind cannot understand. The founders of all the great religions in the world have this advantage, that they were mostly uneducated men, and, speaking the simple language of uneducated men, can make the mass of mankind understand them. The real value, therefore, of religion, the real value of all the great religions in the world, is that it can convey the inspiration or living emotion which it contains even to the mass of mankind. In order to understand how this inspiration or living emotion came into religion, into all the great religions of the world, let us find out how these religions came into the world.

Now, the founders of all the great religions in the world, as we know, were all of them men of exceptionally or abnormally strong emotional nature. This abnormally strong emotional nature made them feel intensely the emotion of love or human affection, which, as I have said, is the source of the inspiration in religion, the soul of religion. This intense feeling or emotion of love or human affection enabled them to see what I have called the indefinable, absolute essence of right and wrong or

justice, the soul of justice which they called righteousness, and this vivid perception of the absolute essence of justice enabled them to see the unity of the laws of right and wrong or moral laws. As they were men of exceptionally strong emotional nature, they had a powerful imagination, which unconsciously personified this unity of moral laws as an almighty supernatural Being. To this supernatural almighty Being, the personified unity of moral laws of their imagination, they gave the name of God, from whom they also believed that the intense feeling or emotion of love or human affection, which they felt, came. In this way, then, the inspiration or living emotion that is in religion came into religion; the inspiration that lights up the rules of moral conduct of religion and supplies the emotion or motive power needful for carrying the mass of mankind, along the straight and narrow way of moral conduct. But now the value of religion is not only that it has an inspiration or living emotion in its rules of moral conduct which lights up these rules and makes it easy for men to obey them. The value of religion, of all the great religions in the world, is that they have an organisation for awakening, exciting, and kindling the inspiration or living emotion in men necessary to make them obey the rules of moral conduct. This organisation in all the great religions of the world is called the Church.

The Church, many people believe, is founded to teach men the belief in God. But that is a great mistake. It is this great mistake of the Christian Churches in modern times which has made honest men like the late Mr. J. A.

Froude feel disgusted with the modern Christian Churches. Mr. Froude says: "Many a hundred sermons have I heard in England on the mysteries of the faith, on the divine mission of the clergy, on apostolic succession, etc., but never one that I can recollect on common honesty, on those primitive commandments, 'Thou shalt not lie' and 'Thou shalt not steal.'" But then, with all deference to Mr. Froude, I think he is also wrong when he says here that the Church, the Christian Church, ought to teach morality. The aim of the establishment of the Church no doubt is to make men moral, to make men obey the rules of moral conduct such as "Thou shalt not lie" and "Thou shalt not steal." But the function, the true function of the Church in all the great religions of the world, is not to teach morality, but to teach *religion*, which, as I have shown you, is not a dead square rule such as "Thou shalt not lie" and "Thou shalt not steal," but an inspiration, a living emotion to make men obey those rules. The true function of the Church, therefore, is not to teach morality, but to *inspire* morality, to inspire men to be moral; in fact, to inspire and fire men with a living emotion which makes them moral. In other words, the Church in all the great religions of the world is an organisation, as I said, for awakening and kindling an inspiration or living emotion in men necessary to make them obey the rules of moral conduct. But how does the Church awaken and kindle this inspiration in men?

Now, as well all know, the founders of all the great religions of the world not only gave an inspiration or

living emotion to the rules of moral conduct which they taught, but they also inspired their immediate disciples with a feeling and emotion of unbounded admiration, love, and enthusiasm for their person and character. When the great teachers died, their immediate disciples, in order to keep up the feeling and emotion of unbounded admiration, love, and enthusiasm which they felt for their teacher, founded a Church. That, as we know, was the origin of the Church in all the great religions of the world. The Church thus awakens and kindles the inspiration or living emotion in men necessary to make them obey the rules of moral conduct, by keeping up, exciting and arousing, the feeling and emotion of unbounded admiration, love, and enthusiasm for the person and character of the first Teacher and Founder of religion which the immediate disciples originally felt. Men rightly call not only the belief in God, but the belief in religion a *faith*, a trust; but a trust in whom? In the first teacher and founder of their religion who, in Mohammedanism is called the Prophet and in Christianity the Mediator. If you ask a conscientious Mohammedan why he believes in God and obeys the rules of moral conduct, he will rightly answer you that he does it because he believes in Mohammed the Prophet. If you ask a conscientious Christian why he believes in God and obeys the rules of moral conduct, he will rightly answer you that he does it because he *loves* Christ. Thus you see the belief in Mohammed, the love of Christ, in fact the feeling and emotion, as I said of unbounded admiration, love, and enthusiasm for

the first Teacher and Founder of religion which it is the function of the Church to keep up, excite and arouse in men—is the source of inspiration, the real power in all the great religions of the world by which they are able to make men, to make the mass of mankind obey the rules of moral conduct.*

I have been a long way, but now I can answer the question which you asked me awhile ago. You asked me, you will remember, how without a belief in God which religion teaches—how can one make men, make the mass of mankind, follow and obey the moral rule which Confucius teaches in his State religion—the absolute duty of loyalty to the Emperor? I have shown you that it is not the belief in God taught by religion which really makes men obey moral rules or rules of moral conduct. I showed you that religion is able to make men obey the rules of moral conduct principally by means of an organisation called the Church which awakens and kindles in men an inspiration or living motion necessary to make them obey those rules. Now, in answer to your question I am going to tell you that the system of the teachings of Confucius, called Confucianism, the State religion in China, like the Church religion in other countries, makes men obey the rules of moral conduct also by means of an organisation corresponding to the Church of the Church religion in other countries. This organisation in the State religion of

* Mencius, speaking of the two purest and most Christlike characters in Chinese history, said: "When men heard of the spirit and temper of Po-yü and Shü-ch'i, the dissolute ruffian became unselfish and the cowardly man had courage." Mencius Bk. III, Part II IX, 11.

Confucianism in China is—the *school*. The school is the Church of the State religion of Confucius in China. As you know, the same word “*chiao*” in Chinese for religion is also the word for education. In fact, as the Church in China is the school, *religion to the Chinese means education*. The aim and object of the school in China is not, as in modern Europe and America to-day, to teach men how to earn a living, how to make money, but, like the aim and object of the Church religion, to teach men to understand what Mr. Froude calls the primitive commandment, “Thou shalt not lie” and “Thou shalt not steal”; in fact, to teach men to know what is right, and wrong. “Whether we provide for action or conversation, says Dr. Johnson, “whether we wish to be useful or pleasing, the first requisite is the religious and moral knowledge of right and wrong.

But then we have seen that the Church of the Church religion is able to make men obey the rules of moral conduct by awakening and kindling in men an inspiration or living emotion, and that it awakens and kindles this inspiration or living emotion principally by exciting and arousing the feeling and emotion of unbounded admiration, love, and enthusiasm for the character and person of the first Teacher and Founder of religion. Now, here there is a difference between the school—the Church of the State religion of Confucius in China—and the Church of the Church religion in other countries. The school—the

Church of the State religion in China--it is true, enables and makes men obey the rules of moral conduct, like the Church of the Church religion, also by awakening and kindling in men an inspiration or living emotion. But the means which the school in China uses to awaken and kindle this inspiration or living emotion in men are different from those of the Church of the Church religion. The school, the Church of the State religion of Confucius in China, does not awaken and kindle this inspiration or living emotion in men by exciting and arousing the feeling of unbounded admiration, love, and enthusiasm for Confucius. Confucius in his lifetime did indeed inspire in his immediate disciples a feeling and emotion of unbounded admiration, love, and enthusiasm, and, after his death, has inspired the same feeling and emotion in all great men who have studied and understood him. But Confucius even while he lived did not inspire, and, after his death, has not inspired in the mass of mankind the same feeling and emotion of admiration, love, and enthusiasm which the founders of all the great religions in the world, as we know, have inspired. The mass of the population in China do not adore and worship Confucius as the mass of the population in Mohammedan countries adore and worship Mohammed, or as the mass of the population in European countries adore and worship Jesus Christ. In this respect Confucius does not belong to the class of men called founders of a religion. In order to be a founder of a religion in the European sense of the word, a man must have an

abnormally strong emotional nature. Confucius indeed was descended from a race of kings, the house of Shang, the dynasty which ruled over China before the dynasty under which Confucius lived—a race of men who had the strong emotional nature of the Hebrew people. But Confucius himself lived under the dynasty of the House of Chow—a race of men who had the fine intellectual nature of the Greeks. Thus Confucius was, if I may use a comparison, a Hebrew by birth, with the strong emotional nature of the Hebrew race, who was trained in the best intellectual culture, who had all that which in the best intellectual culture of the civilisation of the Greeks could give him. In fact, like the great Goethe in modern Europe, the great Goethe whom the people of Europe will one day recognise as the most perfect type of humanity, the *real European* which the civilisation of Europe has produced, as the Chinese have acknowledged Confucius to be the most perfect type of humanity, the *real Chinaman*, which the Chinese civilisation has produced—like the great Goethe, I say, Confucius was too cultured a man to belong to the class of men called founders of religion. Indeed, even while he lived Confucius was not known to be what he was, except by his most intimate and immediate disciples.

The school in China, I say, the Church of the State religion of Confucius, does not awaken and kindle the inspiration or living emotion necessary to make men obey

the rules of moral conduct by exciting and arousing the feeling and emotion of admiration, love, and enthusiasm for Confucius. But then how does the school in China awaken and kindle the inspirations or living emotions necessary to make man obey the rules of moral conduct? Confucius says: "In education the feeling and emotion is aroused by the study of *poetry*; the judgement is formed by the study of good taste and good manners; the education of the character is completed by the study of music." The school—the Church of the State religion in China—awakens and kindles the inspiration or living emotion in men necessary to make them obey the rules of moral conduct by teaching them poetry—in fact, the works of all really great men in literature, which, as I told you, has the inspiration or living emotion that is in the rules of moral conduct of religion. Matthew Arnold, speaking of Homer and the quality of *nobleness* in his poetry, says: "The nobleness in the poetry of Homer and of the few great men in literature can refine the raw, natural man, can *transmute* him." In fact, whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report, if there be any virtue and if there be any praise—the school, the Church of the State religion in China, makes men think on these things, and in making them think on these things, awakens and kindles the inspiration or living emotion necessary to enable and make them obey the rules of moral conduct.

But then you will remember I told you that the works of really great men in literature, such as the poetry of Homer, cannot reach the mass of mankind, because all great men in literature speak the language of educated men which the mass of mankind cannot understand. Such being the case, how then does system of the teachings of Confucius, Confucianism, the State Religion in China, awaken and kindle in the mass of mankind, in the mass of the population in China, the inspiration or living emotion necessary to enable and make them obey the rules of moral conduct? Now, I told you that the organization in the State Religion of Confucius in China corresponding to the Church of the Church Religion in other countries, is the School. But the real organization in the State Religion of Confucius in China corresponding exactly to the Church of the Church Religion in other countries is—the *Family*. The real Church—of which the School is but an adjunct—the real and true Church of the State Religion of Confucius in China, is the Family with its ancestral tablet or chapel in every house, and its ancestral Hall or Temple in every village and town. I have shown you that the source of inspiration, the real motive power by which all the great Religions of the world are able to make men, to make the mass of mankind obey the rules of moral conduct, is the feeling and emotion of unbounded admiration, love and enthusiasm which it is the function of the Church to excite and arouse in men for the first Teachers and Founders of those Religions. Now the source of inspiration, the real motive power by which

the State Religion of Confucius in China is able to make men, to make the mass of the population in China obey the rules of moral conduct is the "*Love for their father and mother.*" The Church of the Church Religion, Christianity, says: "Love Christ." The Church of the State Religion of Confucius in China—the ancestral tablet in every family—says "Love your father and your mother." St. Paul says:—"Let every man that nameth the name of Christ depart from iniquity." But the author of the book on Filial Piety, (孝經) written in the Han dynasty, the counterpart of the *Imitatio Christi* in China, says: "Let everyone who loves his father and mother depart from iniquity." In short, as the essence, the motive power, the source of real inspiration of the Church religion, Christianity, is the Love of Christ, so the essence, the motive power, the source of real inspiration of the State Religion, Confucianism in China, is the "Love of father and mother"—Filial Piety, with its cult of ancestor worship.

Confucius says:—"To gather in the same place where our fathers before us have gathered; to perform the same ceremonies which they before us have performed; to play the same music which they before us have played: to pay respect to those whom they honoured; to love those who were dear to them; in fact, to serve them now dead as if they were living, and now departed, as if they were still with us, that is the highest achievement of Filial Piety." Confucius, further says:—"By cultivating respect for the dead, and carrying the memory back to the distant past,

the good in the people will grow deep." That then is how the State Religion in China, Confucianism, awakens and kindles in men, the inspiration or living emotion necessary to enable and make them obey the rules of moral conduct, the highest and most important of all these rules being the absolute Duty of Loyalty to the Emperor, just as the highest and most important rules of moral conduct in all the Great Religions of the world is fear of God. In other words, the Church Religion, Christianity, says:—"Fear God and obey Him." But the State Religion of Confucius, or Confucianism, says:—"Honour the Emperor and be loyal to him." The Church Religion, Christianity, says:—"If you want to fear God and obey Him, you must first love Christ." The State Religion of Confucius, or Confucianism, says:—"If you want to honour the Emperor and be loyal to him, you must first love your father and mother."

Now I have shown you why it is that there is no conflict between the heart and the head in the Chinese civilization for these last 2,500 years since Confucius' time. The reason why there is no such conflict is because the Chinese people, even the mass of the population in China, do not feel the need of Religion—I mean Religion in the European sense of the word; and the reason why the Chinese people do not feel the need of religion is because the Chinese people have in Confucianism something which can take the place of Religion. That something, I have shown you, is the principle of absolute Duty of Loyalty to the Emperor; the Code of Honour called *Ming fen ta yi*, which Confucius teaches in the State Religion which he has given to the

Chinese nation. The greatest service, therefore I said, which Confucius has done for the Chinese people is in giving them this State Religion in which he taught the absolute Duty of Loyalty to the Emperor.

Thus much I have thought it necessary to say about Confucius and what he has done for the Chinese nation, because it has a very important bearing upon the subject of our present discussion, the Spirit of the Chinese People. For I want to tell you and you will understand it from what I have told you, that a Chinaman, especially if he is an educated man, who knowingly forgets, gives up or throws away the Great Code of Honour, the *Ming fen ta yi* in the State Religion of Confucius in China, which teaches the absolute Divine Duty of Loyalty to the Emperor or Sovereign to whom he has once given his allegiance, such a Chinaman is a man who has lost the spirit of the Chinese people, the spirit of his nation, of his race: *he is no longer a real Chinaman.*

Finally, let me shortly sum up what I want to say on the subject of our present discussion—the Spirit of the Chinese People or what is the real Chinaman. The real Chinaman, I have shown you, is a man who lives the life of a man of adult reason with the simple heart of a child, and the spirit of the Chinese people is a happy union of soul with intellect. Now if you will examine the products of the Chinese mind in their standard works of art and literature, you will find that it is this happy union of soul with the intellect which makes them so satisfying and delightful. What Matthew Arnold says of the poetry of

Homer is true of all Chinese standard literature, that "it has not only the power of profoundly touching that natural heart of humanity, which it is the weakness of Voltaire that he cannot reach, but can also address the understanding with all Voltaire's admirable simplicity and rationality."

Matthew Arnold calls the poetry of the best Greek poets the priestess of imaginative reason. Now the spirit of the Chinese people, as it is seen in the best specimens of the products of their art and literature, is really what Matthew Arnold calls imaginative reason. Matthew Arnold says:—"The poetry of later Paganism lived by the senses and understanding: the poetry of mediæval Christianity lived by the heart and imagination. But the main element of the modern spirit's life, of the modern European spirit to-day, is neither the senses and understanding, nor the heart and imagination, it is the *imaginative reason*."

Now if it is true what Mathew Arnold says here that the element by which the modern spirit of the people of Europe to-day, if it would live right—has to live, is imaginative reason, then you can see how valuable for the people of Europe this Spirit of the Chinese people is,—this spirit which Matthew Arnold calls imaginative reason. How valuable it is, I say, and how important it is that you should study it, try to understand it, love it, instead of ignoring, despising and trying to destroy it.

But now before I finally conclude, I want to give you a warning. I want to warn you that when you think of this Spirit of the Chinese People, which I have tried to explain to you, you should bear in mind that it is not a

science, philosophy, theosophy, or any "ism," like the theosophy or "ism" of Madame Blavatsky or Mrs. Besant. The Spirit of the Chinese People is not even what you would call a mentality an active working of the brain or mind. The Spirit of the Chinese People, I want to tell you, is a state of mind, a temper of the soul, which you cannot learn as you learn shorthand or Esperanto—in short, a mood, or in the words of the poet, a serene and blessed mood,

Now last of all I want to ask your permission to recite to you a few lines of poetry from the most Chinese of the English poets, Wordsworth, which better than anything I have said or can say, will describe to you the serene and blessed mood which is the Spirit of the Chinese People. These few lines of the English poet will put before you in a way I cannot hope to do, that happy union of soul with intellect in the Chinese type of humanity, that serene and blessed mood which gives to the real Chinaman his inexpressible gentleness. Wordsworth in his lines on Tintern Abbey says:—

“ nor less I trust
 To them I may have owed another gift
 Of aspect more sublime:—that blessed mood
 In which the burthen of the mystery,
 In which the heavy and the weary weight
 Of all this unintelligible world
 Is lightened:—that serene and blessed mood
 In which the affections gently lead us on—
 Until the breath of this corporeal frame

And even motion of our human blood
Almost suspended, we are laid asleep
In body, and become a living soul:
While with an eye made quiet by the power
Of harmony, and the deep power of joy,
We see into the life of things."

The serene and blessed mood which enables us *to see into the life of things*: that is imaginative reason, that is the Spirit of the Chinese People.



THE CHINESE WOMAN.

Matthew Arnold, speaking of the argument taken from the Bible which was used in the House of Commons to support the Bill for enabling a man to marry his deceased wife's sister, said: "Who will believe when he really considers the matter, that when the feminine nature, the feminine ideal and our relations with them are brought into question, the delicate and apprehensive genius of the Indo-European race, the race which invented the Muses, and Chivalry, and the Madonna, is to find its last word on this question in the institution of a Semitic people whose wisest King had seven hundred wives and three hundred concubines?"

The two words I want for my purpose here from the above long quotation are the words "feminine ideal." Now what is the Chinese feminine ideal? What is the Chinese people's ideal of the feminine nature and their relations to that ideal? But before going further, let me, with all deference to Matthew Arnold, and respect for his Indo-European race, say here that the feminine ideal of the Semitic race, of the old Hebrew people is not such a horrid one as Matthew Arnold would have us infer from the fact that their wisest King had a multitude of wives and concubines. For here is the feminine ideal of the old Hebrew people, as we find it in their literature: "Who can find a virtuous woman? for her price is far above rubies. The heart of her husband doth safely trust in her.

She rises also while it is yet night and giveth meat to her household and a portion to her maidens. She layeth her hands to the spindle and her fingers hold the distaff. She is not afraid of snow for her household; for *all her household are clothed in scarlet*. She openeth her mouth with wisdom and *in her tongue is the law of kindness*. She looketh well to the ways of her household and eateth not the bread of idleness. Her children rise up and call her blessed, her husband also and he praiseth her."

This, I think, is not such a horrid, not such a bad ideal after all,—this feminine ideal of the Semitic race. It is of course not so ethereal as the Madonna and the Muses, the feminine ideal of the Indo-European race. However, one must, I think, admit,—the Madonna and the Muses are very well to hang up as pictures in one's room, but if you put a broom into the hands of the Muses or send your Madonna into the kitchen, you will be sure to have your rooms in a mess and you will probably get in the morning no breakfast at all. Confucius says, "The ideal is not away from the actuality of human life. When men take something away from the actuality of human life as the Ideal,—that is not the true ideal."* But if the Hebrew feminine ideal cannot be compared with the Madonna and the Muses, it can very well, I think, compare with the modern European feminine ideal, the feminine ideal of the Indo-European race in Europe and America to-day. I will not speak of the suffragettes in England.

But compare the old Hebrew feminine ideal with the modern feminine ideal such as one finds it in modern novels, with the heroine, for instance of Dumas' *Dame aux Camelias*. By the way, it may interest people to know that of all the books in European literature which have been translated into Chinese, the novel of Dumas with the Madonna of the Mud as the superlative feminine ideal has had the greatest sale and success in the present up-to-date modern China. This French novel called in Chinese the *Cha-hua-nu* (茶花女) has even been dramatised and put on the stage in all the up-to-date Chinese theatres in China. Now if you will compare the old feminine ideal of the Semitic race, the woman who is not afraid of the snow for her household, for she has clothed them all in scarlet, with the feminine ideal of the Indo-European race in Europe to-day, the Camelia Lady who has no household, and therefore clotheth not her household, but herself in scarlet and goes with a Camelia flower on her breast to be photographed: then you will understand what is true and what is false, tinsel civilization.

Nay, even if you will compare the old Hebrew feminine ideal, the woman who layeth her hands to the spindle and whose fingers hold the distaff, who looketh well to the ways of her household and eateth not the bread of idleness, with the up to-date modern Chinese woman who layeth her hands on the piano and whose fingers hold a big bouquet, who, dressed in tight fitting yellow dress with a band of tinsel gold around her head, goes to show herself and sing before a miscellaneous crowd in the Y. M. C. A.

Hall: if you compare these two feminine ideals, you will then know how fast and far modern China is drifting away from true civilization. For the womanhood in a nation is the flower of the civilization, of the state of civilization in that nation.

But now to come to our question: what is the Chinese feminine ideal? The Chinese feminine ideal I answer, is essentially the same as the old Hebrew feminine ideal with one important difference of which I will speak later on. The Chinese feminine ideal is the same as the old Hebrew ideal in that it is not an ideal merely for hanging up as a picture in one's room; nor an ideal for a man to spend his whole life in caressing and worshipping. The Chinese feminine ideal is an ideal with a broom in her hands to sweep and clean the rooms with. In fact the Chinese written character for a wife (婦) is composed of two radicals—(女) meaning a woman and (帚) meaning a broom. In classical Chinese, a wife is called the Keeper of the Provision Room—a Mistress of the Kitchen (主中饋). Indeed the true feminine ideal,—the feminine ideal of all people with a true, not tinsel civilization, such as the old Hebrews, the ancient Greeks and the Romans, is essentially the same as the Chinese feminine ideal: the true feminine ideal is always the *Hausfrau*, the house wife, *la dame de menage* or *châtelaine*.

But now to go more into details. The Chinese feminine ideal, as it is handed down from the earliest times, is summed up in three obediences (三從) and

Four Virtues (四德). Now what are the four virtues? The are: first womanly character (女德); second, womanly conversation (女言); third, womanly appearance (女容); and lastly, womanly work (女工) Womanly character means not extraordinary talents or intelligence, but modesty, cheerfulness, chastity, constancy, orderliness, blameless conduct and perfect manners. Womanly conversation means not eloquence or brilliant talk, but refined choice of words, never to use coarse or violent language, to know when to speak and when to stop speaking. Womanly appearance means not beauty or prettiness of face, but personal cleanliness and faultlessness in dress and attire. Lastly, womanly work means not any special skill or ability, but assiduous attention to the spinning room, never to waste time in laughing and giggling and work in the kitchen to prepare clean and wholesome food, especially when there are guests in the house. These are the four essentials in the conduct of a woman as laid down in the "Lessonss for Women" (女誡), written by Ts'ao Ta Ku (曹大家) or Lady Ts'ao, sister of the great historian Pan Ku (班固) of the Han Dynasty.

Then again what do the Three Obediences (三從) in the Chinese feminine ideal mean? They mean really three self sacrifices or "live for's." That is to say, when a woman is unmarried, she is to live for her father (在家從父); when married, she is to live for her husband (出嫁從夫); and, as a widow, she is to live for her children (夫死從子). In fact, the chief end of a woman in China is not to live for herself, or for society; not to be a reformer

or to be president of the woman's natural feel Society; not to live even as a saint or to do good to the world; the chief end of a woman in China is to live as a *good daughter, a good wife and a good mother.*

A foreign lady friend of mine once wrote and asked me whether it is true that we Chinese believe, like the Mohamedans, that a woman has no soul. I wrote back and told her that we Chinese do not hold that a woman has no soul, but that we hold that a woman,—a true Chinese woman has no *self*. Now speaking of this "no self" in the Chinese woman leads me to say a few words on a very difficult subject,—a subject which is not only difficult, but, I am afraid almost impossible for people with the modern European education to understand, viz. concubinage in China. This subject of concubinage, I am afraid, is not only a difficult, but also a dangerous subject to discuss in public. But, as the English poet says,

Thus fools rush in where angels fear to tread.

I will try my best here to explain why concubinage in China is not such an immoral custom as people generally imagine.

The first thing I want to say on this subject of concubinage is that it is the *selflessness* in the Chinese woman which makes concubinage in China not only possible, but also *not immoral*. But, before I go further, let me tell you here, that concubinage in China does not mean having many *wives*. By Law in China, a man is allowed to have only *one* wife, but he may have as many

handmaids or concubines as he like. In Japanese a handmaid or concubine is called *te-kaki*, a hand rack or *me-kaki* an eye rack;—i.e. to say, a rack where to rest your hands or eyes on when you are tired. Now the feminine ideal in China, I said, is not an ideal for a man to spend his whole life in caressing and worshipping. The Chinese feminine ideal is, for a wife to live absolutely, selflessly for her husband. Therefore when a husband who is sick or invalided from over work with his brain and mind, requires a handmaid, a hand rack or eye rack to enable him to get well and to fit him for his life work, the wife in China with her selflessness, gives it to him just as a good wife in Europe and America gives an arm chair or goat's milk to her husband when he is sick or requires it. In fact it is the selflessness of the wife in China, her sense of duty, the duty of self sacrifice which allow a man in China to have handmaids or concubines.

But people will say to me, "why ask selflessness and sacrifice only from the woman? What about the man?" To this, I answer, does not the man,—the husband, who toils and moils to support his family, and especially if he is a gentleman, who has to do his duty not only to his family, but to his King and country, and, in doing that has, some time even to give his life: does he not also make sacrifice? The Emperor Kanghsi in a valedictory decree which he issued on his death bed, said that "he did not know until then what a life of sacrifice the life of an Emperor in China is." And yet, let me say here by the way, Messrs. J. B. Bland and Backhouse in their latest book have described

this Emperor Kanghsi as a huge, helpless, horrid Brigham Young, who was dragged into this grave by the multitude of his wives and children. But, of course, for modern men like Messrs. J. P. Bland and Backhouse, concubinage is inconceivable except as something horrid, vile and nasty, because the diseased imagination of such men can conceive of nothing except nasty, vile and horrid things. But that is neither here nor there. Now what I want to say here is that the life of every *true* man—from the Emperor down to the ricksha coolie—and every *true* woman, is a life of sacrifice. The sacrifice of a woman in China is to live selflessly for the man whom she calls husband, and the sacrifice of the man in China is to provide for, to protect at all costs the woman or women whom he has taken into his house and also the children they may bear him. Indeed to people who talk of the immorality of concubinage in China, I would say that to me the Chinese mandarin who keeps concubines is less selfish, less immoral than the European in his motor car, who picks up a helpless woman from the public street and, after amusing himself with her for one night, throws her away again on the pavement of the public street the next morning. The Chinese mandarin with his concubines may be selfish, but he at least provides a house for his concubines and holds himself for life responsible for the maintenance of the women he keeps. In fact, if the mandarin, is selfish, I say that the European in his motor car is not only selfish, but a *coward*. Ruskin says, "The honour of a true soldier is verily not to be able to slay, but to be willing and ready at all times to *be slain*."

In the same way I say, the honour of a woman.—a true woman in China, is not only to love and be true to her husband, but to live absolutely, selflessly for him. In fact, this *Religion of Selflessness* is the religion of the woman, especially, the gentlewoman or lady in China, as the Religion of Loyalty which I have tried elsewhere to explain, is the religion of the man,—the gentleman in China. Until foreigners come to understand these two religions, the “Religion of Loyalty” and “the Religion of Selflessness” of the Chinese people, they can never understand the real Chinaman, or the real Chinese woman.

But people will again say to me, “What about love? Can a man who really loves his wife have the heart to have other women besides her in his house?” To this I answer, yes,—Why not? For the real test that a husband really loves his wife is not that he should spend his whole life in lying down at her feet and caressing her. The real test whether a man truly loves his wife is whether he is anxious and tries in every thing reasonable, not only to protect her, but also not to hurt her, not to hurt her feelings. Now to bring a strange woman into the house must hurt the wife, hurt her feelings. But here, I say, it is what I have called the Religion of selflessness which protects the wife from being hurt: it is this absolute selflessness in the woman in China which makes it possible for her not to feel hurt when she sees her husband bring another woman into the house. In other words, it is the selflessness in the wife in China which enables, *permits* the husband to take a concubine without hurting the wife. For here, let me point

out, a gentleman,—a real gentleman in China, never takes a concubine without the consent of his wife and a real gentlewoman or lady in China whenever there is a proper reason that her husband should take a concubine, will never refuse to give her consent. I know of many cases where having no children the husband after middle age wanted take a concubine, but because the wife refused to give her consent, desisted. I know even of a case where the husband, because he did not want to exact this mark of selflessness from his wife who was sick and in bad health, refused, when urged by the wife, to take a concubine, but the wife, without his knowledge and consent, not only bought a concubine, but actually forced him to take the concubine into the house. In fact, the protection for the wife against the abuse of concubinage in China is the *love of her husband for her*. Instead, therefore of saying that husbands in China cannot truly love their wives because they take concubines, one should rather say it is because the husband in China so *truly* loves his wife that he has the privilege and liberty of taking concubines without fear of his abusing that privilege and liberty. This liberty, this privilege is sometimes and even—when the sense of honour in the men in the nation is low as now in this anarchic China, often abused. But still I say the protection for the wife in China where the husband is allowed to take a concubine, is the love of her husband for her, the love of her husband, and, I must add here, his *tact*.—the perfect good taste in the real Chinese gentleman. I wonder if one man in a thousand among the ordinary Europeans and

Americans, who can keep more than one woman in the same house without turning the house into a fighting cock-pit or hell. In short, it is this tact,—the perfect good taste in the real Chinese gentleman which makes it possible for the wife in China not to feel hurt, when the husband takes and keeps a handmaid, a hand rack, an eye rack in the same house with her. But to sum up,—it is the Religion of selflessness, the absolute selflessness of the woman,—the gentlewoman or lady and the love of the husband for his wife and his tact,—the perfect good taste of a real Chinese gentleman, which, as I said, makes concubinage in China, not only possible, but also *not immoral*. Confucius said, “The Law of the Gentleman takes its rise from the relation between the husband and the wife.”

Now in order to convince those who might still be sceptical that husbands in China *truly* love, can *deeply* love their wives, I could produce abundant proofs from Chinese history and literature. For this purpose I should particularly like to quote and translate here an elegy written on the death of his wife by Yuan (Chen (元 稹), poet of the T'ang dynasty. But unfortunately the piece is too long for quotation here in this already too long article. Those acquainted with Chinese, however, who wish to know how deep the affection,—affection, true love and not sexual passion which in modern times is often mistaken for love,—how deep the love of a husband in China for his wife is, should read this elegy which can be found in any ordinary collection of the T'ang poets. The title of the elegy is, (遣 悲 懷)—“Lines to ease the aching heart.” But as I cannot use this elegy

for my purpose, I will, instead, give here a short poem of four lines written by a modern poet who was once a secretary of the late Viceroy Chang Chih-tung. The poet went together with his wife in the suite of the Viceroy to Wuchang and after staying there many years, his wife, died. Immediately after he too had to leave Wuchang. He wrote the poem on leaving Wuchang. The words in Chinese are.

此	恨	人	人	有
百	年	能	有	幾
痛	哉	長	江	水
同	渡	不	同	歸

The meaning in English is something like this:—
 This grief is common to everyone,
 One hundred years how many can attain?
 But 'tis heart breaking, O ye waters of the Yangtze,
 Together we came,—but together we return not.

The feeling here is as deep, if not deeper; but the words are fewer, and the language is simpler, even than Tennyson's

Break, break, break
 On thy cold grey stones, O sea!

* * * *

But O for the touch of a vanished hand,
 And the sound of a voice that is still!

But now what about the love of a wife in China for her husband? I do not think any evidence is needed to prove this. It is true that in China the bride and bridegroom as a rule never see each other until the marriage day,

and yet that there is love between even bride and bridegroom, can be seen in these four lines of poetry from the T'ang dynasty:—

洞	房	昨	夜	停	紅	燭
待	曉	堂	前	拜	舅	姑
妝	罷	低	聲	問	夫	婿
畫	眉	深	淺	入	時	無

The meaning in English of the above is something like this.

In the bridal chamber last night stood red candles,
Waiting for the morning to salute the father and mother
in the hall,
Toilet finished,—in a low voice she asks her sweetheart
husband,
“Are the shades in my painted eyebrows quite à la mode?”

But here in order to understand the above, I must tell you something about marriage in China. There are in every legal marriage in China six ceremonies(六禮): first, (問名) asking for the name, i.e., formal proposal; second (納綵) receiving the silk presents, i.e., betrothal; third (定期) fixing the day of marriage; fourth (親迎) fetching the bride; fifth (奠鴈) pouring libation before the wild goose, i.e., plighting troth, so-called because the wild goose is supposed to be most faithful in connubial love; sixth (廟見)—temple presentation. Of these six ceremonies, the last two are the most important, I shall therefore here describe them more in detail.

The fourth ceremony, fetching the bride at the present day, is, except in my province Fukien where we keep up

the old customs,—generally dispensed with, as it entails too much trouble and expense to the bride's family. The bride now, instead of being fetched, is sent to the bride-grooms' house. When the bride arrives there, the bridegroom receives her at the gate and himself opens the door of the bridal chair and leads her to the hall of the house. There the bride and bride-groom worship Heaven and Earth (拜天地), i.e. to say, they fall on their knees with their faces turned to the door of the hall with a table carrying two red burning candles before the open sky and then the husband pours libations on the ground,—in presence of the pair of wild geese (if wild goose cannot be had, an ordinary goose) which the bride has brought with her. This is the ceremony called *Tien yen* pouring libation before the wild goose; plighting of troth between man and woman—he vowing to be true to her, and she, to be true to him, just as faithful as the pair of wild geese they see before them. From this moment, they become, so to speak, natural *sweetheart husband* and *sweetheart wife*, bound only by the moral law, the Law of the Gentleman,—the word of honour which they have given to each other, but not yet by the *Civic Law*. This ceremony therefore may be called the moral or religious marriage.

After this comes the ceremony called the (交拜) mutual salutation between bride and bride-groom. The bride standing on the right side of the hall first goes on her knees before the bride-groom,—he going on his knees to her at the same time. Then they change places. The bride-groom now standing where the bride stood, *goes on*

his knees to her,—she returning the salute just as he did. Now this ceremony of *chiao pai* mutual salutation, I wish to point out here, proves beyond all doubt that in China this is *perfect equality* between man and woman, between husband and wife.

As I said before, the ceremony of plighting troth may be called the moral or religious marriage as distinguished from what may called the *civic* marriage, which comes three days after.—In the moral or religious marriage, the man and woman becomes husband and wife before the moral Law—before God. The contract so far is solely between the man and woman. The State or, as, in China, the Family takes the place of the State in all social and civic life—the State acting only as Court of appeal,—the Family takes no cognisance of the marriage or contract between the man and woman here in this, what I have called the moral or religious marriage. In fact on this first day and until the *civic* marriage takes place on the third day of the marriage, the bride is not only *not* introduced, but also not allowed to see or be seen by the members of the bride-groom's family.

Thus for two days and two nights the bride-groom and the bride in China live, so to speak not as legal, but, as *sweetheart husband* and *sweet-heart wife*. On the third day, —then comes the last ceremony in the Chinese marriage—the *Miao-chien*, the temple presentation or civic marriage. I say, on the third day because that is the rule *de rigueur* as laid down in the Book of Rites (三日廟見). But now to save trouble and expense, it is generally performed on the

day after. This ceremony—the temple presentation, takes place, when the ancestral temple of the family clan is near by,—of course in the ancestral temple. But for people living in towns and cities where there is no ancestral temple of the family clan near by, the ceremony is performed before the miniature ancestral chapel or shrine—which is in the house of every respectable family, even the poorest in China. This ancestral temple, chapel or shrine with a tablet or red piece of paper on the wall, as I have said elsewhere, is the *church* of the State Religion of Confucius in China corresponding to the church of the Church Religion in Christian countries.

This ceremony—the temple presentation begins by the father of the bride groom or failing him, the nearest senior member of the family, going on his knees before the ancestral tablet—thus announcing to the spirits of the dead ancestors that a young member of the family has now brought a wife home into the family. Then the bride groom and bride one after the other, each goes on his and her knees before the same ancestral tablet. From this moment the man and woman becomes husband and wife,—not only before the moral Law or God,—but before the Family, before the State, before Civic Law. I have therefore called this ceremony of *miao chien*, temple presentation in the Chinese marriage,—the civic or civil marriage. Before this civic or civil marriage, the woman, the bride,—according to the Book of Rites,—is not a legal wife (不廟見不成婦). When the bride happens to die before this ceremony of temple presentation, she is not allowed—

according to the Book of Rites—to be buried in the family burying ground of her husband and her memorial tablet is not put up in the ancestral temple of his family clan.

Thus we see the contract in a legal civic marriage in China is not between the woman and the man. The contract is between the woman and the family of her husband. She is not married to him, but *into his family*. In the visiting card of a Chinese lady in China, she does not write, for instance, Mrs. Ku Hung-ming, but literally “Miss Feng, gone to the home of the family (originally from) Tsin An adjusts her dress,” (歸晉安馮氏檢衿). —The contract of marriage in China being *between the woman and the family of her husband*,—the husband and wife can neither of them repudiate the contract without the consent of the husband’s family. This I want to point out here, is the fundamental difference between a marriage in China and a marriage in Europe and America. The marriage in Europe and America,—is what we Chinese would call a sweet-heart marriage, a marriage, bound solely by love between the individual man and the individual woman. But in China the marriage is, as I have said, a civic marriage, a contract not between the woman and the man, *but between the woman and the family of her husband*,—in which she has obligations not only to him, but also to his family, and through the family, to society,—to the social or civic order; in fact, to the State. Finally let me point out here that it is this civic conception of marriage which gives solidarity and stability to the family, to the social or civic order, to the State in China. Until there

fore, let me be permitted to say here,—the people in Europe and America understand what true *civic life* means, understand and have a true conception of what it is really to be a citizen,—a citizen not each one living for himself, but each one living first for his family, and through that for the civic order or State,—there can then be no such thing as a stable society, civic order or State in the true sense of the word.—A State such as we see it in modern Europe and America to-day, where the men and women have not a true conception of civic life,—such a State with all its parliament and machinery of government, may be called, if you like,—a big Commercial Concern, or as it really is, in times of war, a gang of brigands and pirates,—but not a State. In fact, I may permitted further to say here, it is the false conception of a State as a big commercial concern having only the selfish material interests of those who have the biggest shares in the concern to be considered,—this false conception of a State with the *esprit de corps* of brigands, which is, at bottom, the cause of the terrible war now going on in Europe. In short, without a true conception of civic life there can be no true State and without a true State, how can there be civilisation. To us Chinese, a man who does not marry, who has no family, no home which he has to defend, cannot be a patriot, and if calls himself a patriot,—we Chinese call him a *brigand patriot*. In fact in order to have a true conception of a State or civic order, one must first have a true conception of a family, and to have a true conception of a family, of family life, one must first of all have a true conception of

marriage,—marriage not as a sweetheart marriage, but as a civic marriage which I have in the above tried to describe.

But to return from the digression. Now you can picture to yourself how the sweet-heart wife waiting for the morning—to salute the father and mother of her husband, toilet finished, in a low voice, whispers to her sweet-heart husband and asks if her eyebrows are painted quite à la mode—Here you see, I say, there is love between husband and wife in China, although they have not seen each other before the marriage—even on the third day of the marriage. But if you think the love in the above is not deep enough, then take just these two lines of poetry from a wife to her absent husband.

常 君 懷 歸 日
是 妾 斷 腸 時

The day when you think of coming home.

Ah! then my heart will already be broken.

Rosalind in Shakespeare's "As you Like it" says to her cousin Celia: "O coz, coz, my pretty little coz, that thou knowest how many fathom deep I am in love! But I cannot be sounded: my affection hath an unknown bottom, like the bay of Portugal." Now the love of a woman,—of a wife for her husband in China and also the love of the man—of the husband for his wife in China, one can truly say, is like Rosalind's love, many fathom deep and cannot be sounded; it has an unknown bottom like the bay of Portugal.

But, I will now speak of the difference which, I said, there is between the Chinese feminine ideal and the

feminine ideal of the old Hebrew people. The Hebrew lover in the Songs of Solomon, thus addresses his lady love: "Thou art beautiful, O my love, as Tirzah, comely as Jerusalem, *terrible as an army with banners!*" People who have seen beautiful dark-eyed Jewesses even to day, will acknowledge the truth and graphicness of the picture which the old Hebrew lover here gives of the feminine ideal of his race. But in and about the Chinese feminine ideal, I want to say here, there is nothing *terrible* either in a physical or in a moral sense. Even the Helen of Chinese history,—the beauty, who with one glance brings down a city and with another glance destroys a kingdom (一顧傾人城再顧傾人國) she is terrible only mataphorically. In an essay on "the Spirit of the Chinese people," I said that the one word which will sum up the total impression which the Chinese type of humanity makes upon you is the English word, "gentle." If this is true of the real Chinaman, it is truer of the real Chinese woman. In fact this "gentleness" of the real Chinaman, in the Chinese woman, becomes divine *meekness*. The meekness, the submissiveness of the woman in China is like that of Milton's Eve in the "Paradise Lost," who says to her husband.

God is thy law, thou, mine; to know no more
Is woman's happiest knowledge and her praise.

Indeed this quality of perfect meekness in the Chinese feminine ideal you will find in the feminine ideal of no other people,—of no other civilization, Hebrew, Greek or Roman. This perfect, *divine* meekness in the Chinese feminine ideal you will find only in one civilization,—the

Christian civilization, when that civilization in Europe reached its perfection, during the period of the *Renaissance*. If you will read the beautiful story of Griselda in Boccaccio's *Decameron* and see the true Christian feminine ideal shown there, you will then understand what this perfect submissiveness, this *divine* meekness, meekness to the point of absolute selflessness,—in the Chinese feminine ideal means. In short, in this quality of divine meekness, the *true* Christian feminine ideal is the Chinese feminine ideal, with just a shade of difference. If you will carefully compare the picture of the Christian Madonna with,—not the Buddhist Kuan Yin,—but with the pictures of women fairies and genii painted by famous Chinese artists, you will be able to see this difference,—the difference between the Christian feminine ideal, and the Chinese feminine ideal. The Christian Madonna is meek and so is the Chinese feminine ideal. The Christian Madonna is *ethereal* and so is the Chinese feminine ideal. But the Chinese feminine ideal is more than all that; the Chinese feminine ideal is *debonair*. To have a conception of what this charm and grace expressed by the word *debonair* mean, you will have to go to ancient Greece,—

o ubi campi
Sperchesoque et virginibus bacchata Lacaenis
Taygeta !

In fact you will have to go to the fields of Thessaly and the streams of Spercheios, to the hills alive with the dances of the Laconian maidens,—the hills of Taygetus.

Indeed I want to say here that even now in China since the period of the Sung Dynasty (A.D. 960), when what may be called the Confucian Puritanism of the Sung philosophers has narrowed, petrified, and in a way, *vulgarised* the spirit of Confucianism, the spirit of the Chinese civilization—since then, the womanhood in China has lost much of the grace and charm,—expressed by word *debonair*. Therefore if you want to see the grace and charm expressed by the word *debonair* in the true Chinese feminine ideal, you will have to go to Japan where the women there at least, even to this day, have preserved the pure Chinese civilization of the T'ang Dynasty. It is this grace and charm expressed by the word *debonair* combined with the *divine meekness* of the Chinese feminine ideal, which gives the air of *distinction* (名貴) to the Japanese woman,—even to the poorest Japanese woman to-day.

In connection with this quality of charm and grace expressed by the word *debonair*, allow me to quote to you here a few words from Matthew Arnhold with which he contrasts the *brick-and-mortar* Protestant English feminine ideal with the delicate Catholic French feminine ideal. Comparing Eugénie de Guérin, the beloved sister of the French poet Maurice de Guérin, with an English woman who wrote poetry Miss Emma Tatham,—Matthew Arnold says: “The French woman is a Catholic in Languedoc; the English woman is a Protestant at Margate, Margate the brick and mortar image of English Protestantism, representing it in all its prose, all its uncomeliness,—and let me add, all its salubrity. Between the external form

and fashion of these two lives, between the Catholic Madlle de Guerin's *nadalet* at the Languedoc Christmas, her chapel of moss at Easter time, her daily reading of the life of a saint,—between all this and the bare, blank, narrowly English setting of Miss Tatham's Protestantism, her "union in Church fellowship with the worshippers at Hawley Square, Margate," her singing with the soft, sweet voice, the animating lines.

My Jesus to know, and feel His Blood flow
'Tis life everlasting, 'tis heaven below!"

her young female teachers belonging to the Sunday school and her "Mr. Thomas Rowe, a venerable class-leader"—what a dissimilarity. In the ground of the two lives, a likeness; in all their circumstances, what unlikeness! An unlikeness, it will be said, in that which is non-essential and indifferent. Non-essential,—yes; indifferent,—no. The signal *want of grace and charm*—in the English Protestantism's setting of its religious life is not an indifferent matter; it is a real weakness. *This ought ye to have done, and not to have left the other undone.*"

Last of all I wish to point out to you here the most important quality of all, in the Chinese feminine ideal, the quality which preeminently distinguishes her from the feminine ideal of all other people or nations ancient or modern. This quality in the women in China, it is true, is common to the feminine ideal of every people or nation with any pretension to civilization, but this quality, I want to say here, developed in the Chinese feminine ideal to such a degree of perfection as you will find it nowhere else in

the world. This quality of which I speak, is described by the two Chinese words *yu hsien* (幽閒) which, in the quotation I gave above from the "Lessons for Women," by Lady T'sao,—I translated as modesty and cheerfulness. The Chinese word *yu* (幽) literally means retired, secluded, occult and the word *hsien* (閒) literally means "at ease or leisure." For the Chinese word *yu*,—the English "modesty, bashfulness" only gives you an idea of its meaning. The German word *Sittsamkeit* comes nearer to it. But perhaps the French *pudeur* comes nearest to it of all. This *pudeur*, I may say here, this bashfulness, the quality expressed by the Chinese word *yu* (幽) is the essence of all womanly qualities. The more a woman has this quality of *pudeur* developed in her, the more she has of womanliness,—of femininity, in fact, the more she is a perfect or ideal woman. When on the contrary a woman loses this quality expressed by the Chinese word *yu* (幽), loses this bashfulness, this *pudeur*, she then loses altogether her womanliness, her femininity, and with that, her perfume, her fragrance and becomes a mere piece of human meat or flesh. Thus, it is this *pudeur*, this quality expressed by the Chinese word *yu* (幽) in the Chinese feminine ideal which makes or ought to make every true Chinese woman instinctively feel and know that it is wrong to show herself in public; that it is *indecent*, according to the Chinese idea, to go on a platform and sing before a crowd in the hall even of the Y. M. C. A. In fine, it is this *yu hsien* (幽閒), this love of seclusion, this sensitiveness against the "garish eye of day;" this *pudeur*,

in the Chinese feminine ideal, which gives to the true Chinese woman in China as to no other woman in the world,—a perfume, a perfume sweeter than the perfume of violets, the ineffable fragrance of orchids.

In the oldest Love song, I believe, of the world, which I translated for the *Peking Daily News* two years ago—the first piece in the *Shih Ching* or Book of Poetry, the Chinese feminine ideal is thus described,

The birds are calling in the air,—
An islet by the river-side;
The maid is meek and debonair,
Oh! Fit to be our Prince's bride.

The words *yao t'iao* (窈窕) have the same signification as the words *yu hsien* (幽閒) meaning literally *yao* (窈) secluded, meek, shy, and *t'iao* (窕) attractive, debonair, and the words *shu nu* (淑女) mean a pure, chaste girl or woman. Thus here in the oldest love song in China, you have the three essential qualities in the Chinese feminine ideal, viz. love of seclusion, bashfulness or *pudeur*, ineffable grace and charm expressed by the word debonair and last of all, purity or chastity. In short, the real or true Chinese woman is chaste; she is bashful, has *pudeur*; and she is attractive and debonair. This then is the Chinese feminine ideal,—the real "Chinese Woman."

In the Confucian Catechism (中庸) which I have translated as the Conduct of Life, the first part of the book containing the practical teaching of Confucius on the conduct of life concludes with the description of a Happy Home thus:

“When wife and children dwell in anison,
‘Tis like to harp and lute well-played in tune,
When brothers live in concord and in peace,
The strain of harmony shall never cease.
Make then your Home thus always gay and bright.
You wife and dear ones shall be your delight.”

This Home in China is the minature Heaven,—as the State with its civic order, the Chinese Empire,—is the real Heaven, the Kingdom of God come upon this earth, to the Chinese people. Thus, as the gentleman in China with his hopour, his Religion of Loyalty is the guardian of the *State*, the Civic Order, in China, so the Chinese woman, the Chinese gentlewoman or lady, with her debonair charm and grace, her purity, her pudeur, and above all, her Religion of Selflessness,—is the the Guardian Angel of the minature Heaven, the *Home* in China.



THE CHINESE LANGUAGE.

All foreigners who have tried to learn Chinese say that Chinese is a very difficult language. But is Chinese a difficult language? Before, however, we answer this question, let us understand what we mean by the Chinese language. There are, as everybody knows, two languages. I do not mean dialects,—in China, the spoken and the written language. Now, by the way, does anybody know the reason why the Chinese insist upon having these two distinct, spoken and written languages? I will here give you the reason. In China, as it was at one time in Europe when Latin was the learned or written language, the people are properly divided into two distinct classes, the educated and the uneducated. The colloquial or spoken language is the language for the use of the uneducated, and the written language is the language for the use of the really educated. In this way *half educated* people do not exist in this country. That is the reason, I say, why the Chinese insist upon having two languages. Now think of the consequences of having half educated people in a country. Look at Europe and America to-day. In Europe and America since, from the disuse of Latin, the sharp distinction between the spoken and the written language has disappeared, there has arisen a class of half educated people who are allowed to use the same language as the really educated people, who talk of civilisation, liberty, neutrality, militarism and panslavinism without in the least understanding

what these words really mean. People say that Prussian Militarism is a danger to civilisation. But to me it seems, the half educated man, the mob of half educated men in the world to-day, is the real danger to civilisation. But that is neither here nor there.

Now to come to the question: is Chinese a difficult language? My answer is, yes and no. Let us first take the spoken language. The Chinese spoken language, I say, is not only *not* difficult, but as compared with the half dozen languages that I know,—the easiest language in the world except,—Malay. Spoken Chinese is easy because it is an extremely simple language without case, without tense, without regular and irregular verbs; in fact without grammar, or any rule whatever. But people have said to me that Chinese is difficult even because of its simplicity; even because it has no rule or grammar. That, however, cannot be true. Malay like Chinese, is also a simple language without grammar or rules, and yet Europeans who learn it, do not find it difficult. Thus in itself and for the Chinese people colloquial or spoken Chinese at least is not a difficult language. But for educated Europeans and especially for half educated Europeans who come to China, even colloquial or spoken Chinese is a very difficult language: and why? Because spoken or colloquial Chinese is, as I said, the language of uneducated men, of thoroughly uneducated men; in fact the language of a child. Now as a proof of this, we all know how easily European children learn colloquial or spoken Chinese, while learned

philologues and sinologues insist in saying that Chinese is so difficult. Chinese, colloquial Chinese, I say again, is the language of a child. My first advice therefore to my foreign friends who want to learn Chinese is "Be ye like little children, you will then not only enter into the Kingdom of Heaven, but you will also be able to learn Chinese."

We now come to the written or book language, written Chinese. But here before I go further, let me say there are also different kinds of written Chinese. The Missionaries class these under two categories and call them easy *wen li* and difficult *wen li*. But that, in my opinion, is not a satisfactory classification. The proper classification, I think, should be, plain dress written Chinese; official uniformed Chinese, and full court dress Chinese. If you like to use Latin, call them: *littera communis* or *littera officinalis* (common or business Chinese); *littera classica minor* (lesser classical Chinese); and *littera classica major* (higher classical Chinese.)

Now many foreigners have called themselves or have been called Chinese scholars. Writing an article on Chinese scholarship, some thirty years ago for the *N. C. Daily News* I then said: "Among Europeans in China, the publication of a few dialogues in some provincial *patois* or the collection of a hundred Chinese proverbs at once entitles a man to call himself a Chinese scholar." "There is," I said, "of course no harm in a name, and with the extraterritoriality clause in the treaty, an Englishman

in China may with impunity call himself Confucius, if so it pleases him." Now what I want to say here is this: how many foreigners who call themselves Chinese scholars, have any idea of what an asset of civilisation is stored up in that portion of Chinese literature which I have called the *Classica majora*, the literature in full court dress Chinese? I say an asset of civilisation, because I believe that this *Classica majora* in Chinese literature will be able to transform one day even the raw natural men who are now fighting in Europe as patriots, but with the fighting instincts of wild animals; transform them into peaceful, gentle and civil persons. Now the object of civilisation, as Ruskin says, is to make mankind into *civil* persons who will do away with coarseness, violence, brutality and fighting.

But *revenons à nos moutons*. Is then written Chinese a difficult language? My answer again is, yes and no. I say, written Chinese, even what I have called the full court dress Chinese, the *classica majora* Chinese, is not difficult, because, like the spoken or colloquial Chinese, it is extremely simple. Allow me to show you by an average specimen taken at random how extremely simple, written Chinese even when dressed in full court dress uniform, is. The specimen I take is a poem of four lines from the poetry of the T'ang dynasty describing what sacrifices the Chinese people had to make in order to protect their civilisation against the wild half civilized fierce Huns from the North. The works of the poem in Chinese are:

誓	掃	匈	奴	不	願	身
五	千	貂	錦	喪	胡	塵
可	憐	無	定	河	邊	骨
猶	是	春	閨	夢	裏	人

which translated into English word for word mean:

Swear sweep the Huns not care self,

Five thousand sable embroidery perish desert dust;

Alas! Wuting riverside bones,

Still are Spring chambers dream inside men!

A free English version of the poem is something like this:—

They vowed to sweep the heathen hordes

From off their native soil or die:

Five thousand tasseled knights, sable-clad,

All dead now on the desert lie.

Alas! the white bones that bleach cold

Far off along the Wuting stream,

Still come and go as living men

Home somewhere in the loved one's dream.

Now, if you will compare it with my poor clumsy English version, you will see how plain in words and style, how simple in ideas, the original Chinese is. How plain and simple in words, style and ideas: and yet how *deep* in thought, how *deep* in feeling it is.

In order to have an idea of this kind of Chinese literature,—deep thought and deep feeling in extremely simple language,—you will have to read the Hebrew Bible. The Hebrew Bible is one the deepest books in all the

literature of the world and yet how plain and simple in language. Take this passage for instance: "How is this faithful city become a harlot! Thy men in the highest places are disloyal traitors and companions of thieves; every one loveth gifts and followeth after rewards; they judge not the fatherless neither doth the cause of the widow come before them." (Is. I 21-23), or this other passage from the same prophet:—"I will make children to be their high officials and babes shall rule over them. And the people shall be oppressed. The child shall behave himself proudly against the old man and the base against the honourable!" What a picture! The picture of the awful state of a nation or people as we see it in China today. In fact, if you want to have literature which can transmute men, can civilise mankind, you will have to go to the literature of the Hebrew people or of the ancient Greeks or to Chinese literature. But Hebrew and Greek are now become dead languages, whereas Chinese is a living language—the language of four hundred million people still living to-day.

But now to sum up what I want to say on the Chinese language. Spoken as well written Chinese is, in one sense, a very difficult language. It is difficult, not because it is complex. Many European languages such as Latin and French are difficult because they are complex and have many rules. Chinese is difficult not because it is complex, but because it is *deep*. It is difficult because it is a language, for expressing deep feeling in simple language.)

That is the secret of the difficulty of the Chinese language. In fact, as I have said else where, Chinese is a language of the heart: a poetical language. That is the reason why even a simple letter in prose written in classical Chinese reads like poetry. In order to understand written Chinese, especially what I call full court dress Chinese, you must have your full nature,—the heart and the head, the soul and the intellect equally developed.

It is for this reason that for people with modern European education, Chinese is especially difficult, because modern European education develops principally only one part of a man's nature—his intellect. In other words, Chinese is difficult to a man with modern European education, because Chinese is a deep language and modern European education, which aims more at quantity than quality of knowledge is apt to make a man *shallow*. Finally for half educated people, even the spoken language, as I have said, is difficult. For half educated people it may be said of them as was once said of rich men, it is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle, than for them to understand high classical Chinese and for this reason: because written Chinese is a language only for the use of *really educated* people. In short, written Chinese, classical Chinese is difficult because it is the language of really educated people and real education is a difficult thing but as the Greek proverb says, "all beautiful things are difficult."

But before I conclude, let me here give another specimen of written Chinese to illustrate what I mean by

simplicity and depth of feeling which is to be found even in the *Classica Minora*, literature written in official uniformed Chinese. It is a poem of four lines by a modern poet written on New year's eve. The words in Chinese are:—

		示	內		
莫	道	參	貧	卒	歲
北	風	曾	過	幾	番
明	年	桃	柳	堂	前
還	汝	春	光	滿	眼
					看

which, translated word for word, mean:—

Don't say home poor pass year hard,
 North wind has blown many times cold,
 Next year peach willow hall front trees
 Pay-back you spring light full eyes see.

A free translation would be something like this:—

TO MY WIFE.

Fret not,—though poor we yet can pass the year;
 Let the north wild blow ne'er so chill and drear,
 Next year when peach and willow are in bloom,
 You'll yet see Spring and sunlight in our home.

Here is another specimen longer and more sustained. It is a poem by Tu Fu, the Wordsworth of China, of the T'ang Dynasty. I will here first give my English translation. The subject is

MEETING WITH AN OLD FRIEND.

In life, friends seldom are brought near;
 Like stars, each one shines in its sphere.

To-night,—oh! what a happy night!
 We sit beneath the same lamplight.
 Our youth and strength last but a day.
 You and I—ah! our hairs are grey.
 Friends! Half are in a better land,
 With tears we grasp each other's hand.
 Twenty more years, —short, after all,
 I once again ascend your hall.
 When we met, you had not a wife;
 Now you have children,—such is life!
 Beaming, they greet their father's chum;
 They ask me from where I have come.
 Before our say, we each have said,
 The table is already laid.
 Fresh salads from the garden near,
 Rice mixed with millet,—frugal cheer.
 When shall we meet? 'tis hard to know.
 And so let the wine freely flow.
 This wine, I know, will do no harm.
 My old friend's welcome is so warm.
 To-morrow I go,—to be whirled
 Again into the wide, wide world.

The above, my version I admit, is almost doggerel, which is meant merely to give the meaning of the Chinese text. But here is the Chinese text which is not doggerel, but *poetry*—poetry simple to the verge of colloquialism, yet with a grace, dignity pathos and *nobleness* which I cannot reproduce and which perhaps it is impossible to reproduce, in English in such simple language.

影
賈

熱

商光蒼腸堂行方漿梁觴長茫
與燭己中子成何酒黃十意茫
參燈各(熟)君忽來羅間累故兩
如此髮呼上女我女炊舉君事
動共(鬢)驚重兒問兒新一感世
見(歹)時鬼載婚執己韭難醉岳
相何幾爲十未父及春面不山
不復能半二君敬未剪會亦隔
生夕壯舊知別然答雨稱觴日
人今少訪焉昔怡閨夜主十明



JOHN SMITH IN CHINA.

"The Philistine not only ignores all conditions of life which are not his own but he also demands that the rest of mankind should fashion its mode of existence after his own." * ..GOETHE.

Mr. W. Stead once asked: "What is the secret of Marie Corelli's popularity?" His answer was: "Like author, like reader; because the John Smiths who read her novels live in Marie Corelli's world and regard her as the most authoritative exponent of the Universe in which they live, move and have their being." What Marie Corelli is to the John Smiths in Great Britain, the Rev. Arthur Smith is to the John Smiths in China.

Now the difference between the really educated person and the half educated one is this. The really educated person wants to read books which will tell him the real truth about a thing, whereas the half-educated person prefers to read books which will tell him what he wants the thing to be, what his vanity prompts him to wish that the thing should be. John Smith in China wants very much to be a superior person to the Chinaman and the Rev. Arthur Smith writes a book to prove conclusively that he, John Smith, is a very much superior person to the Chinaman. Therefore, the Rev. Arthur Smith is a person very dear to John Smith, and the "Chinese Characteristics" become a Bible to John Smith.

* "Der Philister negiert nicht nur andere Zustände als der seinige ist, er will auch dass alle übrigen Menschen auf seine Weise existieren sollen,"—GOETHE.

But Mr. W. Stead says, "It is John Smith and his neighbours who now rule the British Empire." Consequently I have lately taken the trouble to read the books which furnish John Smith with his ideas on China and the Chinese.

The Autocrat at the Breakfast Table classified minds under the heads of arithmetical and algebraical intellects. "All economical and practical wisdom," he observes, "is an extension or variation of the arithmetical formula $2 \text{ plus } 2 \text{ equal } 4$. Every philosophical proposition has the more general character of the expression $a \text{ plus } b \text{ equal } c$." Now the whole family of John Smith belong decidedly to the category of minds which the Autocrat calls arithmetical intellects. John Smith's father, John Smith senr, alias John Bull, made his fortune with the simple formula $2 \text{ plus } 2 \text{ equal } 4$. John Bull came to China to sell his Manchester goods and to make money and he got on very well with John Chinaman because both he and John Chinaman understood and agreed perfectly upon the formula $2 \text{ plus } 2 \text{ equal } 4$. But John Smith Junr, who now rules the British Empire, comes out to China with his head filled with $a \text{ plus } b \text{ equal } c$ which he does not understand—and not content to sell his Manchester goods, wants to civilise the Chinese or, as he expresses it, to "spread Anglo-Saxon ideals." The result is that John Smith gets on very badly with John Chinaman, and, what is still worse, under the civilising influence of John Smith's $a \text{ plus } b \text{ equal } c$ Anglo-Saxon ideals, John Chinaman, instead of being a good, honest, steady

customer for Manchester goods neglects his business, goes to Chang Su-ho's Gardens to celebrate the Constitution, in fact becomes a mad, raving reformer.

I have lately, by the help of Mr. Putnam Weale's "Reshaping of the Far East" and other books, tried to compile a Catechism of Anglo-Saxon Ideal for the use of Chinese students. The result, so far, is something like this:—

1.—What is the chief end of man? •

The chief end of man is to glorify the British Empire.

2.—Do you believe in God?

Yes, when I go to Church.

3.—What do you believe in when you are not in Church?

I believe in interests—in what will pay.

4.—What is justification by faith?

To believe in everyone for himself.

5.—What is justification by works.

Put money in your pocket.

6.—What is Heaven?

Heaven means to be able to live in Bubbling Well Road* and drive in victorias.

7.—What is Hell?

Hell means to be unsuccessful.

• 8.—What is a state of human perfectibility?

Sir Robert Hart's Custom Service in China.

9.—What is blasphemy?

* The most fashionable quarter in Shanghai.

To say that Sir Robert Hart is not a great man of genius.

10.—What is the most heinous sin?

To obstruct British trade.

11.—For what purpose did God create the four hundred million Chinese?

For the British to trade upon.

12.—What form of prayer do you use when you pray?

• We thank Thee, O Lord, that we are not as the wicked Russians and brutal Germans are, who want to partition China.

13.—Who is the great Apostle of the Anglo-Saxon Ideals in China.

Dr. Morrison, the *Times* Correspondent in Peking.

It may be a libel to say that the above is a true statement of Anglo-Saxon ideals, but any one who will take the trouble to read Mr. Putnam Weale's book will not deny that the above is a fair representation of the Anglo-Saxon ideals of Mr. Putnam Weale and John Smith who reads Mr. Putnam Weale's books.

The most curious thing about the matter is that the civilising influence of John Smith's Anglo-Saxon ideals is really taking effect in China. Under this influence John Chinaman too is now wanting to glorify the Chinese Empire. The old Chinese literati with his eight-legged essays was a harmless humbug. But foreigners will find to their cost that the new Chinese literati who under the influence of John Smith's Anglo-Saxon ideals are clamouring for a constitution, are likely to become an intolerable and

dangerous nuisance. In the end I fear John Bull Senior will not only find his Manchester goods trade ruined, but he will even be put to the expense of sending out a General Gordon or Lord Kitchener to shoot his poor old friend John Chinaman who has become *non compos mentis* under the civilising influence of John Smith's Anglo-Saxon ideals. But that is neither here nor there.

What I want to say here in plain, sober English is this. It is a wonder to me that the Englishman who comes out to China with his head filled with all the arrant nonsense written in books about the Chinese, can get along at all with the Chinese with whom he has to deal. Take this specimen, for instance, from a big volume, entitled "The Far East: its history and its questions," by Alexis Krausse.

"The crux of the whole question affecting the Powers of the Western nations in the Far East lies in the appreciation of the true inwardness of the Oriental mind. An Oriental not only sees things from a different standpoint to (!) the Occidental, but his whole train of thought and mode of reasoning are at variance. The very sense of perception implanted in the Asiatic varies from that with which we are endowed!"

After reading the last sentence an Englishman in China, when he wants a piece of *white* paper, if he follows the ungrammatical Mr. Krausse's advice, would have to say to his boy:—"Boy, bring me a piece of *black* paper." It is, I think, to the credit of practical men among foreigners in China that they can put away all this

nonsense about the true inwardness of the Oriental mind when they come to deal practically with the Chinese. In fact I believe that these foreigners get on best with the Chinese and are the most successful men in China who stick to $2 \text{ plus } 2 \text{ equal } 4$, and leave the $a \text{ plus } b \text{ equal } c$ theories of Oriental inwardness and Anglo-Saxon ideals to John Smith and Mr. Krausse. Indeed when one remembers that in those old days, before the Rev. Arthur Smith wrote his "Chinese Characteristics," the relations between the heads or taipans of great British firms such as Jardine, Matheson and their Chinese compradores* were always those of mutual affection, passing on to one or more generations; when one remembers this, one is inclined to ask what good, after all, has clever John Smith with his $a \text{ plus } b \text{ equal } c$ theories of Oriental inwardness and Anglo-Saxon ideals done, either to Chinese or foreigners?

Is there then no truth in Kipling's famous dictum that East is East and West is West? Of course there is. When you deal with $2 \text{ plus } 2 \text{ equal } 4$, there is little or no difference. It is only when you come to problems such as $a \text{ plus } b \text{ equal } c$ that there is a great deal of difference between East and West. But to be able to solve the equation $a \text{ plus } b \text{ equal } c$ between East and West, one must have real aptitude for higher mathematics. The misfortune of the world to-day is that the solution of the equation $a \text{ plus } b \text{ equal } c$ in Far Eastern problems, is in

* Chinese employed by foreign firms in China to be agents between them and Chinese merchants.

the hands of John Smith who not only rules the British Empire, but is an ally of the Japanese nation,—John Smith who does not understand the elements even of algebraical problems. The solution of the equation $a + b = c$ between East and West is a very complex and difficult problem. For in it there are many unknown quantities, not only such as the East of Confucius and the East of Mr. K'ang Yu-wei and the Viceroy Tuan Fang, but also the West of Shakespeare and Goethe and the West of John Smith. Indeed when you have solved your $a + b = c$ equation properly, you will find that there is very little difference between the East of Confucius and the West of Shakespeare and Goethe, but you will find a great deal of difference between even the West of Dr. Legge the scholar, and the West of the Rev. Arthur Smith. Let me give a concrete illustration of what I mean.

The Rev. Arthur Smith, speaking of Chinese histories says:—

“Chinese histories are antediluvian, not merely in their attempts to go back to the ragged edge of zero of time for a point of departure, but in the interminable length of the sluggish and turbid current which carries on its bosom not only the mighty vegetation of past ages, but wood, hay and stubble past all reckoning. None but a relatively timeless race could either compose or read such histories: none but the Chinese memory could store them away in its capacious abdomen?”

Now let us hear Dr. Legge on the same subject. Dr. Legge, speaking of the 23 standard dynastic histories of China, says:—

“No nation has a history so thoroughly digested; and on the whole it is trustworthy.”

Speaking of another great Chinese literary collection, Dr. Legge says:—

“The work was not published, as I once supposed by Imperial authority, but under the superintendence and at the expense (aided by other officers) of Yuen Yun, Governor-General of Kwangtung and Kwangse, in the 9th year of the last reign, of Kien-lung 1820. The publication of so extensive a work shows a *public spirit and zeal for literature* among the high officials of China which should keep foreigners from thinking meanly them.”

The above then is what I mean when I say that there is a great deal of difference not only between the East and West but also between the West of Dr. Legge, the scholar who can appreciate and admire zeal for literature, and the West of the Rev. Arthur Smith who is the beloved of John Smiths in China.



A GREAT SINOLOGUE.

Don't forget to be a gentleman of sense, while you try to be a great scholar;

Don't become a fool, while you try to be a great scholar.

Confucius Sayings, Ch.: V†. 11.

I have lately been reading Dr. Giles, "*Adversaria Sinica*," and in reading them, was reminded of a saying of another British Consul Mr. Hopkins that "when foreign residents in China speak of a man as a sinologue, they generally think of him as a fool."

Dr. Giles has the reputation of being a great Chinese scholar. Considering the quantity of work he has done, that reputation is not undeserved. But I think it is now time that an attempt should be made to accurately estimate the quality and real value of Dr. Giles' work.

In one respect Dr. Giles has the advantage over all sinologues past and present,—he possesses the literary gift: he can write good idiomatic English. But on the other hand Dr. Giles utterly lacks the philosophical insight and sometimes even common sense. He can translate Chinese sentences, but he cannot interpret and understand Chinese thought. In this respect, Dr. Giles has the same characteristics as the Chinese literati. Confucius says, "When men's education or book learning get the better of their natural qualities, they become *literati*" (Chap. VI. 16.)

To the Chinese literati, books and literature are merely materials for writing books and so they write books upon books. They live, move and have their being in a

world of books, having nothing to do with the world of real human life. It never occurs to the literati that books and literature are only means to an end. The study of books and literature to the true scholar is but the means to enable him to interpret, to criticise, to understand human life.

Mathew Arnold says, "It is through the apprehension either of all literature,—the entire history of the human spirit;—or of a single great literary work as a connected whole, that the power of literature makes itself felt." But in all that Dr. Giles has written, there is not a single sentence which betrays the fact that Dr. Giles has conceived or even tried to conceive the Chinese literature as a connected whole.

It is this want of philosophical insight in Dr. Giles which makes him so helpless in the arrangement of his materials in his books. Take for instance his great dictionary. It is in no sense a dictionary at all. It is merely a collection of Chinese phrases and sentences, translated by Dr. Giles without any attempt at selection, arrangement, order or method. As a dictionary for the purposes of the scholar, Dr. Giles' dictionary is decidedly of less value than even the old dictionary of Dr. Williams.

Dr. Giles' Chinese biographical dictionary, it must be admitted, is a work of immense labour. But here again Dr. Giles shows an utter lack of the most ordinary judgment. In such a work, one would expect to find notices only of really notable men.

Hic manus ob patriam pugnando vulnera passi,
 Quique sacerdotes casti, dum vita manebat,
 Quique pii vates et Phœbo digna locuti,
 Inventas aut qui vitam excoluere per artes,
 Quique sui memores aliquos fecere merendo.

But side by side with sages and heroes of antiquity, with mythical and mythological personages, we find General Tcheng Ki-tong, Mr. Ku Hung-ming, Viceroy Chang Chi-tung and Captain Lew Buah,—the last whose sole title to distinction is that he used often to treat his foreign friends with unlimited quantities of champagne!

Lastly these "Adversaria,"—Dr. Giles latest publication—will not, I am afraid, enhance Dr. Giles reputation as a scholar of sense and judgment. The subjects chosen, for the most part, have no earthly practical or human interest. It would really seem that Dr. Giles has taken the trouble to write these books not with any intention to tell the world anything about the Chinese and their literature but to show what a learned Chinese scholar Dr. Giles is and how much better he understands Chinese than anybody else. Moreover, Dr. Giles, here as elsewhere, shows a harsh and pugnacious dogmatism which is as unphilosophical, as unbecoming a scholar as it is unpleasant. It is these characteristics of sinologues like Dr. Giles which have made, as Mr. Hopkins says, the very name of sinologue and Chinese scholarship a byword and scorn among practical foreign residents in the Far East.

I shall here select two articles from Dr. Giles latest publication and will try to show that if hitherto writings of foreign scholars on the subjects of Chinese learning and

Chinese literature have been without human or practical interest, the fault is not in Chinese learning and Chinese literature.

The first article is entitled "What is filial piety." The point in the article turns upon the meaning of two Chinese characters. A disciple asked what is filial piety. Confucius said: *se nan* (色難) (lit, colour difficult).

Dr. Giles says, "The question is, and has been for twenty centuries past, what do these two characters mean?" After citing and dismissing all the interpretations and translations of native and foreign scholars alike, Dr. Giles of course finds out the true meaning. In order to show Dr. Giles harsh and unscholarly dogmatic manner, I shall here quote Dr. Giles' words with which he announces his discovery. Dr. Giles says:—

"It may seem presumptuous after the above exordium to declare that the meaning lies à la Bill Stumps (!) upon the surface, and all you have to do, as the poet says, is to

Stoop, and there it is;
Seek it not right nor left!

"When Tzu-hsia asked Confucius, 'What is filial piety?' the latter replied simple,

" '*se* (色) to define it, *nan* (難) is difficult,' a most intelligible and appropriate answer."

I shall not here enter into the niceties of Chinese grammar to show that Dr. Giles is wrong. I will only say here that if Dr. Giles is right in supposing that the character *se* (色) is a verb, then in good grammatical

Chinese, the sentence would not read *se nan* (色難), but *se chih uei nan* (色之維難) to define it, is difficult. The impersonal pronoun' *chih* (之) *it*, is here absolutely indispensable, if the character *se* (色) here is used as a verb.

But apart from grammatical niceties, the translation as given by Dr. Giles of Confucius' answer, when taken with the whole context, has no point or sense in it at all.

Tzu hsia asked, what is filial piety? Confucius said, "The difficulty is with the *manner** of doing it. That merely when there is work to be done, the young people should take the trouble of doing it, and when there is wine and food, the old folk are allowed to partake it,—do you really think that is filial piety?" (Discourses and Sayings Ch. II. 9.) Now the whole point in the text above lies in this,—that importance is laid not upon *what* duties you perform towards your parents, but upon *how*—in what manner, with what spirit, you perform those duties.

The greatness and true efficacy of Confucius' moral teaching, I wish to say here, lies in this very point which Dr. Giles fails to see,—the point namely that in the performance of moral duties, Confucius insisted upon the importance not of the *what*, but of the *how*. For herein lies the difference between what is called morality and religion, between mere rules of moral conduct and the vivifying teaching of great and true religious teachers. Teachers of morality merely tell you what kind of action is moral and what kind of action is immoral. But true

*Compare another saying of Confucius 巧言令色 *Ch'iao yen ling se*, plausible speech and fine manners (Discourses and Sayings Ch. I. 3.)

religious teachers do not merely tell you this. True religious teachers do not merely inculcate the doing of the outward act, but insist upon the importance of the manner, the *inwardness* of the act. True religious teachers teach that the morality or immorality of our actions does not consist in *what* we do, but in *how* we do it.

This is what Matthew Arnold calls Christ's method in his teaching. When the poor widow gave her mite, it was not *what* she gave that Christ called the attention of his hearers to, but *how* she gave it. The moralists said, "Thou shalt not commit adultery." But Christ said, "I say unto you that whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her hath already committed adultery."

In the same way the moralists in Confucius' time said: Children must cut firewood and carry water for their parents and yield to them the best of the food and wine in the house: that is filial piety. But Confucius said, "No; that is *not* filial piety." True filial piety does not consist in the mere outward performance of these services to our parents. True filial piety consists in *how*, in what manner, with what spirit we perform these services. The difficulty, said Confucius, is with the *manner* of doing it. It is, I will finally say here, by virtue of this method in his teaching, of looking into the inwardness of moral actions that Confucius becomes, not as the Christian missionaries say, a mere moralist and philosopher, but a great and true religious teacher.

As a further illustration of Confucius method, take the present reform movement in China. The so called pro-

gressive mandarins with applause from foreign newspapers are making a great fuss—even going to Europe and America,—trying to find out what reforms to adopt in China. But unfortunately the salvation of China will not depend upon *what* reforms are made by these progressive mandarins, but upon *how* these reforms are carried out. It seems a pity that these progressive mandarins,—instead of going to Europe and America, to study constitution could not be made to stay at home and study Confucius. For until these mandarins take to heart Confucius' teaching and his method and attend to the *how* instead of the *what* in this matter of reform, nothing but chaos, misery and suffering will come out of the present reform movement in China.

The other article in Dr. Giles "Adversaria Sinica" which I will briefly examine, is entitled—"The four classes."

The Japanese Baron Suyematzu in an interview said that the Japanese divided their people into four classes,—soldiers, farmers, artisans and merchants. Upon this Dr. Giles says. "It is incorrect to translate *shih* (士) as soldier; that is a later meaning." Dr. Giles further says, "in its earliest use the word *shih* (士) referred to civilians."

Now the truth is just on the other side. In its earliest use, the word *shih* (士) referred to gentlemen who in ancient China, as it is now in Europe, bore arms,—the *noblesse* of the sword. Hence the officers and soldiers of an army were spoken of as *shih tau* (士卒).

The civilian official class in ancient China were called *shi* (史)—clericus. When the feudal system in China was abolished (2nd cent. B.C.), and fighting ceased to be the only profession of gentlemen, this civilian official class rose into prominence, became lawyers and constituted the *noblesse* of the robe as distinguished from the *shih* (士) the *nablesses* of the sword.

H.E. the Viceroy Chang of Wuchang once asked me why the foreign consuls who were civil functionaries, when in full dress, wore swords. In reply I said that it was because they were *shih* (士) which in ancient China meant not a civilian scholar, but a gentleman who bore arms and served in the army. H.E. agreed and the next day gave orders that all the pupils in the schools in Wuchang should wear military uniform.

This question therefore which Dr. Giles has raised whether the Chinese word *shih* (士) means a civilian or a military man has a great practical interest. For the question whether China in the future will be independent or come under a foreign yoke will depend upon whether she will ever have an efficient army and that question again will depend upon whether the educated and governing class in China will ever regain the true ancient meaning and conception of the word *shih* (士) not as civilian scholar, but as a gentleman who bears arms and is able to defend his country against aggression.



CHINESE SCHOLARSHIP.

PART I.

Not long ago a body of missionaries created a great deal of amusement by styling themselves, on the cover of some scientific tracts, as "famous savants" *su ju* (宿儒). The idea was of course extremely ridiculous. There is certainly not one Chinaman in the whole Empire who would venture to arrogate to himself the Chinese word *ju*, which includes in it all the highest attributes of a scholar or literary man. We often hear, however, a European spoken of as a Chinese scholar. In the advertisement of the *China Review*, we are told that "among the missionaries a high degree of Chinese scholarship is assiduously cultivated." A list is then given of regular contributors, "all," we are to believe, "well-known names, indicative of sound scholarship and thorough mastery of their subject."

Now in order to estimate the high degree of scholarship said to be assiduously cultivated by the missionary bodies in China, it is not necessary to take such high ideal standards as those propounded by the German Fichte in his lectures upon the Literary Man, or the American Emerson in his Literary Ethics. The late American Minister to Germany, Mr. Taylor, was acknowledged to be a great German scholar; but though an Englishman who has read a few plays of Schiller, or sent to a magazine some verses translated from Heine, might be thought a German scholar among his tea drinking circles, he would scarcely have his name

appear as such in print or placard. Yet among Europeans in China the publication of a few dialogues in some provincial *patois*, or collection of a hundred proverbs, at once entitles a man to be called a Chinese scholar. There is, of course, no harm in a name, and, with the extraterritorial clause in the treaty, an Englishman in China might with impunity call himself Confucius if so it pleases him.

We have been led to consider this question because it is thought by some that Chinese scholarship has passed, or is passing, the early pioneering, and is about to enter a new, stage, when students of Chinese will not be content with dictionary-compiling or such other brick-carrying work, but attempts will be made at works of construction, at translations of the most perfect specimens of the national literature, and not only judgment, but final judgment, supported with reasons and arguments, be passed upon the most venerated names of the Chinese literary Pantheon. We now propose to examine: 1st, how far it is true that the knowledge of Chinese among Europeans is undergoing this change: 2ndly, what has already been done in Chinese scholarship; 3rdly, what is the actual state of Chinese scholarship at the present day; and in the last place, to point out what we conceive Chinese scholarship should be. It has been said that a dwarf standing upon the shoulders of a giant is apt to imagine himself of greater dimensions than the giant; still, it must be admitted that the dwarf, with the advantage of his position, will certainly command a wider and more extensive view. We will, therefore, standing upon the shoulders of those who have preceded us, take a survey of

the past, present, and future of Chinese scholarship; and if, in our attempt, we should be led to express opinions not wholly of approval of those who have gone before us, these opinions, we hope, may not be construed to imply that we in any way plume ourselves upon our superiority: we claim only the advantage of our position.

First, then, that the knowledge of Chinese among Europeans has changed, is only so far true, it seems to us, that the greater part of the difficulty of acquiring a knowledge of the language has been removed. "The once prevalent belief," says Mr. Giles, "in the great difficulty of acquiring a colloquial knowledge, even of a single Chinese dialect has long since taken its place among other historical fictions." Indeed, even with regard to the written language, a student in the British Consular Service, after two years' residence in Peking and a year or two at a Consulate, can now readily make out at sight the general meaning of an ordinary despatch. That the knowledge of Chinese among foreigners in China has so far changed, we readily admit, but what is contended for beyond this we feel very much inclined to doubt.

After the early Jesuit missionaries, the publication of Dr. Morrison's famous dictionary is justly regarded as the *point de départ* of all that has been accomplished in Chinese scholarship. The work will certainly remain a standing monument of the earnestness, zeal and conscientiousness of the early Protestant Missionaries. After Morrison came a class of scholars of whom Sir John Davis and Dr. Gutzlaff might be taken as representatives. Sir John Davis really

knew no Chinese, and he was honest enough to confess it himself. He certainly spoke Mandarin and could perhaps without much difficulty read a novel written in that dialect. But such knowledge as he then possessed, would now-a-days scarcely qualify a man for an interpretership in any of the Consulates. It is nevertheless very remarkable that the notions about the Chinese of most Englishmen, even to this day, will be found to have been acquired from Sir John Davis's book on China. Dr. Gutzlaff perhaps knew a little more Chinese than Sir John Davis; but he attempted to pass himself off as knowing a great deal more than he did. The late Mr. Thomas Meadows afterwards did good service in exposing the pretension of Dr. Gutzlaff, and such other men as the missionaries Huc and Du Halde. After this, it is curious to find Mr. Boulger, in this recent History of China, quoting those men as authorities.

In France, Rémusat was the first to occupy a Chair of Chinese Professorship in any European University. Of his labours we are not in a position to express an opinion. But one book of his attracted notice: it was a translation of a novel, "The Two Cousins." The book was read by Leigh Hunt, and by him recommended to Carlyle, and by Carlyle to John Stirling, who read it with delight, and said that the book was certainly written by a man of genius, but "a man of genius after the dragon pattern." The *Ju Kiao Li*,* as the novel is called in Chinese, is a pleasant enough book to read, but it takes no high place even among the inferior

class of books of which it is a specimen. Nevertheless it is always pleasant to think that thoughts and images from the brain of a Chinaman have actually passed through such minds as those of Carlyle and Leigh Hunt.

After Rémusat followed Stanislas Julien and Pauthier. The German poet Heine says that Julien made the wonderful and important discovery that Mons. Pauthier did not understand Chinese at all and the latter, on the other hand, also made a discovery, namely that Monsieur Julien knew no Sanscrit. Nevertheless the pioneering work done by these writers was very considerable. One advantage they possessed was that they were thorough masters of their own language. Another French writer might be mentioned, Mons. D'Harvey St. Denys, whose translation of the T'ang poets is a breach made into one department of Chinese literature in which nothing has been done before or since.

In Germany Dr. Plath of Munich published a book on China, which he entitled "Die Manchurei." Like all books written in Germany, it is a solid piece of work thoroughly well done. Its evident design was to give a history of the origin of the present Manchu dynasty in China. But the latter portions of the book contain information on questions connected with China, which we know not where to find in any other book written in a European language. Such work as Dr. Williams's 'Middle Kingdom' is a mere nursery story-book compared with it. Another German Chinese scholar is Herr von Strauss, formerly the Minister of a little German principality which has since 1866 been swallowed up by Prussia. The old Minister in his retirement amused

himself with the study of Chinese. He published a translation of Lao Tzu, and recently of the Shih King. Mr. Faber, of Canton, speaks of some portions of his Lao Tzu as being perfect. His translation of the Odes is also said to be very spirited. We have, unfortunately, not been able to procure these books.

The scholars we have named above may be regarded as sinologues of the earliest period, beginning with the publication of Dr. Morrisons's dictionary. The second period began with the appearance of two standard works: 1st, the Tzu Erh Chih of Sir Thomas Wade; 2nd, the Chinese Classics of Dr. Legge.

As to the first, those who have now gone beyond the Mandarin colloquial in their knowledge might be inclined to regard it slightly. But it is, notwithstanding, a great work—the most perfect, within the limits of what was attempted, of all the English books that have been published on the Chinese language. The book, moreover, was written in response to a crying necessity of the time. Some such book had to be written, and lo! it was done, and done in a way that took away all chance of contemporary as well as future competition.

That the work of translating the Chinese Classics had to be done, was also a necessity of the time, and Dr. Legge has accomplished it, and the result is a dozen huge, ponderous tomes. The quantity of work done is certainly stupendous, whether may be thought of the quality. In presence of these huge volumes we feel almost afraid to speak. Nevertheless, it must be confessed that the work does not

altogether satisfy us. Mr. Balfour justly remarks that in translating these classics a great deal depends upon the *terminology* employed by the translation. Now we feel that the terminology employed by Dr. Legge is harsh, crude, inadequate, and in some places, almost unidiomatic. So far for the form. As to the matter, we will not hazard our own opinion, but will let the Rev. Mr. Faber of Canton speak for us. "Dr. Legge's own notes on Mencius," he says, "show that Dr. Legge has not a philosophic understanding of his author." We are certain that Dr. Legge could not have read and translated these works without having in some way tried to conceive and shape to his own mind the teaching of Confucius and his school as a connected whole; yet it is extraordinary that neither in his notes nor in his dissertations has Dr. Legge let slip a single phrase or sentence to show what he conceived the teaching of Confucius really to be, as a philosophic whole. Altogether, therefore, Dr. Legge's judgment on the value of these works cannot by any means be accepted as final, and the translator of the Chinese Classics is yet to come. Since the appearance of the two works above mentioned, many books have been written on China: a few, it is true, of really great scholastic importance; but none, we believe showing that Chinese scholarship has reached an important turning point.

First, there is Mr. Wylie's "Notes on Chinese Literature." It is, however, a mere catalogue, and not a book with any literary pretension at all. Another is the late Mr. Mayers's "Chinese Readers Manual." It is certainly not a work that can lay claim to any degree of perfection.

Novertheless, it is a very great work, the most honest conscientious and unpretending of all the books that have been written on China. Its usefulness, moreover, is inferior only to the Tzu-Erh-Chi of Sir Thomas Wade.

Another Chinese scholar of note is Mr. Herbert A. Giles of the British Consular Service. Like the early French sinologues, Mr. Giles possesses the enviable advantage of a clear, vigorous, and beautiful style. Every object he touches upon becomes at once clear and luminous. But with one or two exceptions, he has not been quite fortunate in the choice of subjects worthy of his pen. One exception is the "Strange Stories from a Chinese Studio," which may be taken as a model of what translation from the Chinese should be. But the *Liao-chia-chih-i*, a remarkably beautiful literary work of art though it be, belongs yet not to the highest specimens of Chinese literature.

Next to Dr. Legge's labours, Mr. Balfour's recent translations of the Nan-hua King of Chuang-tzu is a work of certainly the highest ambition. We confess to having experienced, when we first heard the work announced, a degree of expectation and delight which the announcement of an Englishman entering the Hanlin College would scarcely have raised in us. The Nan-hua King is acknowledged by the Chinese to be one of the most perfect of the highest specimens of their national literatural. Since its appearance two centuries before the Christian era, the influence of the book upon the literature of China is scarcely inferior to the works of Confucius and his schools; while its effect upon the language and spirit of the poetical and

imaginative literatual of succeeding dynasties is almost as exclusive as that of the Four Books and Five Chinese upon the philosophical works of China. But Mr. Balfour's work is not a translation at all; it is simply a *mistranslation*. This, we acknowledge, is a heavy, and for us, daring judgment to pass upon a work upon which Mr. Balfour must have spent many years. But we have ventured it, and it will be expected of us to make good our judgment. We believe Mr. Balfour would hardly condescend to join issue with us if we were to raise the question of the true interpretation of the philosophy of Chuang-tzu. "But,"—we quote from the Chinese preface of Lin Hsi-chung, a recent editor of the Nan-hua King—"in reading a book, it is necessary to understand first the meaning of each single word: then only can you construe the sentences, then only can you perceive the arrangement of the paragraphs; and then, last of all, can you get at the central proposition of the whole chapter." Now every page of Mr. Balfour's translation bears marks that he has not understood the meaning of many single words, that he has not construed the sentences correctly, and that he has missed the arrangement of the paragraphs. If these propositions which we have assumed can be proved to be true, as they can easily be done, being merely points regarding rules of grammar and syntax, it then follows very clearly that Mr. Balfour has missed the meaning and central proposition of whole chapters.

But of all the Chinese scholars of the present day we are inclined to place the Reverend Mr. Faber of Canton at the head. We do not think that Mr. Faber's labours are of

more scholastic value or a higher degree of literary merit than the works of others, but we find that almost every sentence he has written shows a grasp of literary and philosophy principles such as we do not find in any other scholar of the present time. What we conceive these principles to be we must reserve for the next portion of the present paper, when we hope to be able to state the methods, aims, and objects of Chinese scholarship.



CHINESE SCHOLARSHIP

PART II.

Mr. Faber has made the remark that the Chinese do not understand any systematic method of scientific enquiry. Nevertheless in one of the Chinese Classics, called "Higher Education,"* a work which is considered by most foreign scholars as a Book of Platitudes, a concatenation is given of the order in which the systematic study of a scholar should be pursued. The student of Chinese cannot perhaps do better than follow the course laid down in that book namely, to begin his study with the individual, to proceed from the individual to the family, and from the family to the Government.

First, then: it is necessary and indispensable that the student should endeavour to arrive at a just knowledge of the principles of individual conduct of the Chinese. Secondly, he will examine and see how these principles are applied and carried out in the complex social relations and family life of the people. Thirdly, he will be able then to give his attention, and direct his study, to the government and administrative institutions of the country. Such a programme as we have indicated, can, of course, be followed out only in general outline; to carry it fully out would require the devotion and undivided energies of almost a whole lifetime. But we should certainly refuse to consider a man

*Known among foreigners as the "Great Learning."

a Chinese scholar or a attribute to him any high degree of scholarship, unless he had in some way made himself familiar with the principles above indicated. The German poet Goethe says: "In the works of man, as in those of nature, what is really deserving of attention, above everything, 'is—the *intention*.'" Now in the study of national character, it is also of the first importance to pay attention, not only to the actions and practice of the people, but also to their notions and theories; to get a knowledge of what they consider as good and what as bad, what they regard as just and what as unjust, what they look upon as beautiful and what as not beautiful, and how they distinguish wisdom from foolishness. That is what we mean when we say that the student of Chinese should study the principles of individual conduct. In other words, we mean to say that you must get at the *national ideals*. If it is asked how this is to be attained: we answer, by the study of the national literature, in which revelations of the best and highest as well as the worst side of the character of a people can be read. The one object, therefore, which should engage the attention of the foreign student of Chinese, is the standard national literature of the people: whatever preparatory studies it may be necessary for him to go through should serve only as means towards the attainment of that one object. Let us now see how the student is to study the Chinese literature.

"The civilisations of Europe," says a German writer, "rest upon those of Greece, Rome and Palestine; the Indians and Persians and Persians are of the same Aryan

stock as the people of Europe, and are therefore related; and the influence of the intercourse with the Arabs during the Middle Ages, upon European culture has not even to this day, altogether disappeared." But as for the Chinese, the origin and development of their civilisation rest upon foundations altogether foreign to the culture of the people of Europe. The foreign student of Chinese literature, therefore, has all the disadvantages to overcome which must result from the want of community of primary ideas and notions. It will be necessary for him, not only to equip himself with these foreign notions and ideas, but also, first of all, to find their equivalents in the European languages, and if, these equivalents do not exist, to disintegrate them, and to see to which side of the universal nature of man these ideas and notions may be referred. Take, for instance, those Chinese words of constant recurrence in the Classics, and generally translated into English as "benevolence," (仁) "justice," (義) and "propriety." (禮). Now when we come to take these English words together with the context, we feel that they are not adequate: they do not connote all the ideas the Chinese words contain. Again, the word "humanity," is perhaps the most exact equivalent for the Chinese word translated "benevolence;" but then, "humanity" must be understood in a sense different from its idiomatic use in the English language. A venturesome translator would use the "love" and "righteousness" of the Bible, which are perhaps as exact as any other, having regarded both for the sense of the words and the idiom of the language. Now, however, if we

disintegrate and refer the primary notions which these words convey, to the universal nature of of man, we get, at their full significnace: namely, "the good," "the true," and "the beautiful."

But, moreover, the literature of a nation, if it is to be ~~studied~~ at all, must be studied systematically and as one connected whole, and not fragmentarily and without plan or order, as it has hitherto been done by most foreign scholars. "It is," says Mr. Matthew Arnold, "it is through the apprehension, either of all literature,—the entire history of the human spirit,—or of a single great literary work, as a connected whole that the real power of literature makes itself felt." Now how little, we have seen, do the foreign students conceive the Chinese literature as a whole! How little, therefore, do they get at its significance? How little, in fact, do they know it! How little does it become a power in their hands, towards the understanding of the character of the people! With the exception of the labours of Dr. Legge and of one or two other scholars, the people of Europe know of the Chinese literature principally through the translations of novels, and even these not of the best, but of the most commonplace of their class. Just fancy, if a foreigner were to judge of the English literature from the works of Miss Rhoda Broughton, or that class of novels which form the reading stock of school-boys and nursery-maids! It was this class of Chinese literature which Sir Thomas Wade must have had in his mind, when in his wrath he reproached the Chinese with "tenuity of intellect."

Another extraordinary judgment which used to be

passed upon Chinese literature was, that it was excessively over-moral. Thus the Chinese people were actually accused of over morality, while at the same time most foreigners are pretty well agreed that the Chinese are a nation of liars! But we can now explain this by the fact that, besides the trashy novels we have already noticed, the work of translation among students of Chinese was formerly confined exclusively to the Confucian Classics. Nevertheless, there are of course a great many other things in these writings besides morality, and, with all deference to Mr. Balfour, we think that "the admirable doctrines" these books contain are decidedly not "utilitarian and wordly" as they have been judged to be. We will just submit two sentences and ask Mr. Balfour if he really thinks them "utilitarian and mundane." "He who sins against Heaven," said Confucius in answer to a Minister, "he who sins against Heaven has no place where he can turn to and pray." Again, Mencius says: "I love life, but I also love righteousness: but if I cannot keep them both, I would give up life and choose righteousness."

We have thought it worth while to digress so far in order to protest against Mr. Balfour's judgment, because we think that such smart phrases as "a bondsman to antiquity," "a past-master in casuistry" should scarcely be employed in a work purposely philosophical, much less applied to the most venerated name in China. Mr. Balfour was probably led astray by his admiration of the Prophet of Nan-hua, and, in his eagerness to emphasise the superiority of the Taoist over the orthodox school, he has been

betrayen into the use of expressions which, we are sure, his calmer judgment must condemn.

But to return from our digression. We have said that the Chinese literature must be studied as a connected whole. Moreover we have noted that the people of Europe are accustomed to conceive and form their judgment of the literature of China solely from those writings with which the name of Confucius is associated; but, in fact, the literary activity of the Chinese had only just begun with the labours of Confucius, and has since continued through eighteen dynasties, including more than two thousand years. At the time of Confucius, the literary form of writing was still very imperfectly understood.

Here let us remark that in the study of a literature, there is one important point to be attended to, but which has hitherto been completely lost sight of by foreign students of Chinese; namely, the *form* of the literary writings. "To be sure," said the poet Wordsworth, "it was the matter, but then you know the *matter* always comes out of the *manner*." Now it is true that the early writings with which the name of Confucius is associated do not pretend to any degree of perfection, as far as the literary form is concerned: they are considered as classical or standard works not so much for their classical elegance of style or perfection of literary form, as for the value of the matter they contain. The father of Su Tung-po, of the Sung dynasty, remarks that something approaching to the formation of a prose style may be traced in the dialogues of Mencius. Nevertheless Chinese literary writings, both in prose and

poetry, have since been developed into many forms and styles. The writings of the Western Hans, for instance, differ from the essays of the Sung period, much in the same way as the prose of Lord Bacon is different from the prose of Addison or Goldsmith. The wild exaggeration and harsh diction of the poetry of the six dynasties are as unlike the purity, vigour, and brilliancy of the T'ang poets as the early weak and immature manner of Keats is unlike the strong, clear, and correct splendour of Tennyson.

Having thus, as we have shown, equipped himself with the primary principles and notions of the people, the student will then be in a position to direct his study to the social relations of the people; to see how these principles are applied and carried out. But the social institutions, manners and customs of a people do not grow up, like mushrooms, in a night, but are developed and formed into what they are, through long centuries. It is therefore necessary to study the history of the people. Now the history of the Chinese people is as yet almost unknown to European scholars. The so-called History of China, by Mr. Demetrius Boulger, published recently, is perhaps the worst history that could have been written of a civilised people like the Chinese. Such a history as Mr. Boulger has written might be tolerated if written of some such savage people as the Hottentots. The very fact that such a history of China could have been published, serves only to show how very far from being perfect yet is the knowledge of Chinese among Europeans. Without a knowledge of their history, therefore, no correct judgment can be

formed of the social institutions of a people. Such works as Dr. Williams's *Middle Kingdom* and other works on China from want of such knowledge, are not only useless for the purpose of the scholar, but are even misleading for the mass of general readers. Just to take one instance,—the social ceremony of the people. The Chinese are certainly a ceremonious people, and it is true that they owe this to the influence of the teaching of Confucius. Now Mr. Balfour may speak of the pettifogging observances of a ceremonial life as much as he pleases; nevertheless, even “the bows and scrapes of external decorum,” as Mr. Giles calls them, have their roots deep in the universal nature of of man, in that side of human nature, namely, which we have defined as the sense of the beautiful. “In the use of ceremony,” says a disciple of Confucius, “what is important, is to be natural; this is what is really beautiful in the ways of the ancient Emperors,” Again, it is said somewhere in the Classics: “Ceremony is simply the expression of expression of reverence.” (the *Ehrfürcht* of Goethe's *Wilhelm Meister*.) We now see how evident it is that a judgment of the manners and customs of nation should be founded upon the knowledge of the moral principles of the people. Moreover the study, of the Government and political institutions of a country,—which, we have said should be reserved by the student to the last stage of his labours,—must also be founded upon an understanding of their philosophical principles and a knowledge of their history,

We will conclude with a quotation from “The “Higher Education,” or the Book of Platitudes, as foreigners con-

sider it. "The Government of the Empire," it is said in that book, "should begin with the proper administration of the State; the administration of the State begins with the regulation of the family; the regulation of the family begins with the cultivation of the individual." This, then, is what we mean by Chinese Scholarship. •

This article on Chinese Scholarship was written and published in the "N. C. DAILY NEWS" in Shanghai in 1884.—Exactly thirty years ago!



CIVILIZATION AND ANARCHY,

OR

THE MORAL PROBLEM OF THE FAR EASTERN QUESTION.

MOTTO :

Was ist aber die grosse Aufgabe unserer Zeit?

Es ist die Emancipation, nicht bloss die der Irländer, Griechen, &c.,
sondern es ist die Emancipation der ganzen Welt, absonderlich
Europa's, das mündig geworden ist.

HEINE "REISEBILDER."

To many people, no doubt, what is called the Far Eastern question means merely the immediate future of the Chinese Empire. But any one who will give a moment's serious thought to the subject, cannot fail to see that the question does not end there. For, rising far above mere economic questions of trade and finance and political questions of peace and war arising out of international disputes over material interests, there is involved in the Far Eastern question also a moral issue; an issue immensely more serious and perhaps more real than the political future of the Chinese Empire.

In the history of the first Christian Crusade in Europe we are told that "at the second Council held at Clermont in France, the Pope (Urban II.) himself delivered a stirring address to the multitude and as he proceeded, the pent-up emotions of the crowd burst forth and cries of *Deus vult* rose simultaneously from the audience." To us now the

emotions of that crowd seem very inexplicable. Indeed, the Christian Crusades, when we look now with the light of this century at the foolish, religious, and narrow political objects for which they were undertaken, appear to have been extravagant and infatuated enterprises on the part of the people of Europe wilfully to disturb the people of the East. But when we study the intellectual and moral development of the people of Europe, we cannot help admitting that the Christian Crusades, wilful and infatuated expeditions of fanaticism and cupidity though they were, had nevertheless a serious moral design and function to fulfil in the civilization of the human race. There was truly a veritable *Deus vult* (God's will) in that movement, apparently of bigotry and greed. For the eventual result of the Christian Crusades of the middle ages, was, as we know now, the first means of breaking up the then strict monastic civilization of Europe. After the Crusades, came Martin Luther and the Protestant Reformation. "The final result of the Crusades," says M. Guizot in his History of Civilization, "was a step taken towards the emancipation of the human spirit."

Looking now at the present movement of the European nations to the Far East, which in Germany is called *Kolonial Politik*—who can doubt but that the modern Crusade of this Nineteenth Century, although apparently a movement with only grossly material and selfish objects of trade in view, has also a moral design and function to fulfil in the civilization of the human race. The scene at Kiel in Germany and the strangely mediæval language of the

German Emperor when he solemnly pronounced the *Deus vult* upon the modern Crusade, reminded one very strangely of the scene at Clermont in France in 1095. Who knows, then, if the eventual result of the modern Crusade, called "Kolonial Politik," may not, like the Middle Age Crusades Christendom, end in modifying, if not entirely changing, the civilization and structure of society in modern Europe. It was this thought, rather than any idea of the probable future aggressiveness of the yellow race, which inspired the apparently last of the mediæval Emperors of Europe to paint his famous picture of the Yellow Peril (*die gelbe Gefahr*).

But, truly, to any one who takes the trouble to study the moral culture and social order of the people of the Far East, it is really inconceivable how the civilization of the yellow race can in itself be a source of danger to the people of Europe. To Europeans, and especially to unthinking practical Englishmen, who are accustomed to take what modern political economists call "the standard of living" as the test of the moral culture or civilization of a people, the actual life of the Chinese and of the people of the East at the present day, will no doubt appear very sordid and undesirable. But the standard of living by itself is not a proper test of the civilization of a people. The standard of living in America at the present day, is, I believe, much higher than it is in Germany. But although the son of an American millionaire, who regards the simple and comparatively low standard of living among the professors of a German University, may doubt the value of the education

in such a University, yet no educated man, I believe, who has travelled in both countries, will admit that the Germans are a less civilized people than the Americans.

In fact, standard of living may properly be taken as the *condition* of the civilization, but it is not the civilization itself. To take a physical illustration. Heat is the condition of life and health in an animal body; but the degree of heat in the body is not in itself a true and absolute test of the fineness or coarseness of the structure and organisation of that body. An animal body of really fine structure and organisation may from abnormal causes become very cold. In the same way the standard of living among a people may from economic causes become very low; but that in itself is not a proof that the moral culture or civilization of that people is a low one. The failure of a potato crop in Ireland and a long period of continued trade depression in Great Britain may very considerably lower the standard of living in those countries, but one would not, judging from that alone, say that the Irish or the British people have become less civilized.

But if mere standard of living is not civilization—what is civilization? It is really as difficult to define what civilization among nations is as to pronounce what real education is among individual men. I will, however, illustrate what I mean by civilization by a concrete example. Captain Basil Hall, R.N., visiting Korea in 1816, thus gives his impression of an old petty Korean magistrate:

“The politeness and ease with which he accommodated himself were truly admirable; and when it is considered that

that hitherto, in all probability, he was ignorant even of our existence, his propriety of manners would seem to point not only to high rank in society, but also to a high degree of civilization in that society not confirmed by other circumstances. Be that as it may, the incident is curious as showing that however different the state of society may be in different countries, the forms of politeness are much the same in all. This polished character was very well sustained by the chief, as he was pleased with our efforts to oblige him and whatever we seemed to care about, he immediately took an interest in. He was very inquisitive and was always highly gratified when he discovered the use of anything which had puzzled him at first. But there was no extravagant outbursts of admiration, and he certainly would be considered a man of good breeding and keen observation in any part of the would."

Now, what I mean by civilization is this. Any state of society that can produce such a type of humanity as Captain Hall in the above describes, is a civilized society. If the above account gives the type of character of the educated or upper classes of society under the civilization of the people of the Far East, the following description of the characteristics of the Chinese by the late Dr. D. J. Macgowan may serve to show the influence of that civilization upon the common people:—

"In the foregoing survey of the industrial and mercantile life of the Chinese," says Dr. Macgowan, "the one notable feature to be observed in this people is their capacity for combining, which is one of the chief characteristics of

civilized men. To them organisation and combined action are easy, because of their inherent reverence for authority and their law-abiding instincts. Their docility is not that of a broken-spirited emasculated people, but results from habits of self-control and from being long left to self-government in local, communal or municipal matters; as regards the State, they learn self-reliance. 'Were the poorest and least cultured of these people placed by themselves on an island, they would as soon organise themselves into a body politic as men of the same station in life who had been tutored in rational democracy.'

From the above accounts of the civilization of the people of the Far East, it should be abundantly evident that such a civilization cannot in itself possibly be a source of danger to the people of Europe. Nevertheless, it must be admitted that there is undoubtedly a conflict of civilization going on at present between Europe and the Far East. The conflict, however, it seems to me, is not a conflict between the civilization of the yellow race and the civilization of the white race. It is rather a conflict between the civilization of the Far East and what may be called the mediæval civilization of Europe.

Any one who has given any attention to the study of the spirit of modern institutions in Europe cannot have failed to observe that for the last hundred years there has been growing up in Europe under the general name of what called *Liberalism*, the consciousness of a new moral culture and notions of a new social order quite distinct from what may be called the old mediæval culture and social order. At

the end of the last century, just before the first French Revolution, a Frenchman, Du Clos, said: "*Il y a un germe de raison qui commence à se développer en France.*"* Indeed, it is now generally recognised that the ideas and notions of what is now called Liberalism were first properly understood and promulgated by the French philosophical writers of the last century. But it is curious that it should hitherto have remained unrecognised and unsuspected how much the French "philosophers" owe to their study of Chinese books and Chinese institutions, the knowledge of which was then brought to Europe by the Jesuit missionaries. Any one now who will take the trouble of reading the works of Voltaire, Diderot, and especially *L'esprit des lois* of Montesquieu, can see for himself what an impetus that knowledge of Chinese books and institutions gave, if not to the rise of the "*germe de raison*" spoken of by Du Clos, at least to the rapid development and expansion of what are now called Liberal ideas. That "*germe de raison*" developing into Liberal ideas finally, as we now all know, brought about the "*culbute général*" or general breaking-up of the mediæval institutions of Europe in the last century.

What an irony of Providence, I cannot help remarking here, that the Roman Catholic missionaries who came out to China to convert the heathen Chinese, should themselves have been the means of carrying the ideas of the Chinese civilization to Europe, ideas which were the means of breaking-up that very mediæval civilization to which those missionaries spent their lives in trying to convert the Chinese!

I have been a long way—but now we have come to the subject of my essay. This conflict of civilization, or rather the conflict of modern Liberalism and ancient Mediaevalism, is the Moral Problem of the Far Eastern question. It is not a conflict of the white race with the yellow race, but it is rather a struggle on the part of the people of Europe to free themselves completely from their ancient mediæval civilization. It is, in one word, what the Germans call the *Kulturkampf* of the present day.

The source of the mediæval moral culture of Europe is the Christian Bible. The Christian Bible, taking it as a book of what Goethe calls world literature (*Welt-Literatur*) like the Iliad of Homer or Æneid of Virgil, is a very grand book and will never be wholly lost to the world. The moral grandeur of the Old Testament and, as Mr. Matthew Arnold points out, the prepossessingness of the personality of Jesus Christ and the directness and simplicity of his teaching in the New Testament—all these have gone into the bones, so to speak, of the best types of humanity which Europe has produced. What is more, it will always remain of permanent force and value to those upon whom Goethe's *Welt-Literatur* can exert an influence. But it is not so with ordinary men. For the average men of Europe, in order fully to feel the force of the Christian Bible, they must be in the same intellectual state as the people who produced the Bible. But now it is, I think, generally admitted, that the "*germe de raison*" of Du Clos has greatly changed the intellectual state of the average men of Europe. For such men the Christian Bible becomes

difficult of understanding, if not altogether unintelligible, and as a consequence must cease to be a source of true moral culture. The late Professor Huxley said once at a school board meeting in London that if these (British) Islands had no religion at all, it would not enter into his mind to introduce the religious idea by the agency of the Bible.

In one word, we believe the true moral culture of modern Liberalism, if not so strict, perhaps, is a much broader one than the mediæval culture of Europe derived from the Christian Bible. The one appeals chiefly to the passions of hope and fear in man. The new moral culture on the other hand appeals to the whole intelligent powers of man's nature: to his reason as well as to his feelings. The theory about man's nature in the old culture was; "all men are born in sin," *i.e.*, human nature is radically bad. The theory of the modern moral culture is that man's nature is radically good and if properly developed and appealed to will of itself produce moral well-being and social order in the world. The method of the old culture began with "The fear of the Lord is the beginning of Wisdom." The method of education of modern culture says: "A course of higher education consists in bringing out (*educere*) or developing the intelligent powers of man's nature."* The language of the old culture derived from the Christian Bible is figurative language: language of pictures, symbols

* From the *Ta hsio* 大學, or the method of higher Education translated by Dr. Legge, and known to foreigners as the Book of the Great Learning.

and metaphors. The language of modern moral culture is concrete language: the language of science. In the language of the one it is said: "To him that ordereth his conversation aright shall be shown the salvation of God." In the language of the other it is said: "He who would have good government in his country must begin by putting his house in order, and to do that, he must begin by attending properly to his personal conduct."

The above, then, is a summary of the difference between the old mediæval moral culture and what we have called the modern moral culture of Europe in the theory with regard to human nature, in method of education and in language. The effects of the old and modern cultures of Europe upon the life of the people and their social and civil institutions will, we believe, also be different. The effect of the one upon the people is blind, passive obedience to power and authority. The effect of the modern moral culture will be what Dr. Macgowan, speaking of the characteristics of the Chinese, says: "self-reliance on the part of the people as regards the State." The result of the mediæval moral culture of Europe, in one word, was Feudal Government. The result of the modern moral culture which goes under the name of Liberalism will be what Dr. Macgowan calls "rational democracy" *i.e.*, government by free institutions.

Now, European writers are accustomed to speak of the higher Christian civilization as compared with what is called the Confucian civilization of the people of the Far East. The object of the two civilizations no doubt is the same; the moral well-being of man and the keeping of civil

order in the world. But if what I have said of the old and modern moral culture of Europe is true, it must, I think, be admitted that although perhaps the civilization founded upon a moral culture which appeals to the passions of hope and fear is a stronger and even a stricter civilization, yet surely the civilization founded on a moral culture which appeals to the calm reason of man, is if not a higher, yet a broader civilization, one more difficult to attain, and once attained, more enduring and permanent.

In fact, it seems to me that it is really the difficulty of attaining the new modern moral culture on the part of the people of Europe and not the civilization of the yellow race which is at present the real danger, not only to the people of Europe, but to the destiny and civilization of the human race. The population of Europe, having for the most part lost the sense of the force and sanction of their old mediæval moral culture and not having sufficiently attained to the modern moral culture to use it as a restraining force for keeping civil order, have now to be kept in order, not by any moral force at all, but by sheer physical force of police or what is called Militarism. "The state of modern Europe," said Carlyle "is Anarchy *plus* a constable." A French writer put it better: "*C'est la force en attendant le droit.*"

But the enormous cost necessary for maintaining this immense scale of militarism in modern Europe is becoming ruinous to the economic well-being of the people. To escape from this ruin the people of Europe, it seems to me, have two courses open to them: either to struggle hard for

the attainment of the new modern culture or to return to mediævalism. But back to mediævalism the people of Europe will never consent to return. "Wir gehen nicht nach Canossa," the great Prince Bismarck has said. Indeed, the people of Europe, even if they are willing, cannot now get back to the true mediævalism of the past. The people of Europe in trying to return to mediævalism will only arrive either at the extravagances of the Salvation Army or the jugglery of the Ultramontanism of the Jesuits.

Now, if any one would like to know what a force destructive of civilization and all true moral culture the extravagances of the Salvation Army may one day become in Europe, he should read the history of the last Taiping Rebellion in China. The Chinese Christians of that rebellion, throwing away their national moral culture appealing to reason, went back to the moral culture of mediæval Europe, which appeals to the passions of hope and fear in the hearts of the multitude, and the result was devastated provinces and the sacrifice of a million lives.

As for the Ultramontanism of the Jesuits, it is even worse than the extravagances of the Salvation Army. The intellectual jugglery of Ultramontanism of the Jesuits is an outrage upon human nature. The reaction against such an outrage will be, as Carlyle has pointed out, "widespread suffering, mutiny, and delirium; the hot rage of sanseulotic insurrections, the cold rage of resuscitated Tyrannies; brutal degradation of the millions, the pampered frivolty of the units; that awful spectacle, 'the Throne of Iniquity decreeing injustice by a law.'"

— In plain language the practical outcome of Jesuitism may be defined as the Gospel, to use a vulgar expression, of knowing on which side your bread is buttered. The social order founded upon such a mean and base mental habit cannot last. After Louis Napoleon of France came *La Débâcle*, the Commune of Paris. Who knows what is in store for the people of Europe if they were to go back to mediævalism and succeed only in arriving at the Ultramontanism of the Jesuits?

I have said that the civilization of the yellow race can never be a danger to the people of Europe. The danger lies rather, it seems to me, in the ignorant and the wanton way in which the "pampered units" of Europe are urging their governments to deal with this civilization. The press in Europe, and especially in England, which is the mouth-piece of the "pampered units," unites in urging what is called the gunboat policy in China and writes with equanimity upon the partition of China. But I wonder if it ever occurred to anyone to calculate how **much** it would cost the nations of Europe to restore order and police the four hundred million people of China when once the rule of the mandarins is broken up and the population becomes rabid like the people lately in Armenia, in Turkey. The late General Gordon said: "Remember this: an unsatisfied people means more troops." Whatever may be said of the helplessness and abuses of the rule of the mandarins in China at the present day, their rule is a *moral* and not a police rule. Militarism is necessary in Europe but not in China. The foreign gunboat policy has done and will only

do harm to the interests of all concerned, foreigners as well as Chinese. In my opinion, the establishment of an International School for the higher study of Chinese history and literature in Shanghai and at the same time the sending of a large number of Chinese students to Europe and America will do more to foster even the interests of foreign commerce than the most powerful fleet the European nations can send out. But if once Militarism becomes necessary in China, the Chinese will have to become a military power or will have to be kept down by military power from outside. In either case the whole world will have to pay for this added military burden of the world.

Militarism is necessary in Europe because the people are unsatisfied. Militarism is the knight or protector of civilization—*C'est la force en attendant le droit*. Its true function in the mediæval language of Tennyson, is

"To break the heathen and uphold the Christ,"

i.e., to keep down rowdyism, savagery and anarchy. But the Militarism of Europe lately is being made use of, not against anarchy and rowdyism, but against true civilization, against the good government of the Chinese people. The more the Militarism of Europe is thus misused, the more the burden of its cost will increase.

The only possible way, therefore, for the people of Europe to escape from the ruin resulting from the burden of their Militarism, is to struggle for the attainment of what we have called the new moral culture, which now lies under the general name of Liberalism. How long it will take for the people of Europe to attain this, it is impossible to say.

Indeed, it seems to me that the Liberalism of Europe at the end of this century has retrograded. Lord Beaconsfield, speaking of the Liberalism of the England of his time, said that he was astonished to find that it had become an oligarchy. The Liberalism of Europe to-day, it seems to me, has become also an oligarchy: an oligarchy of "pampered units." The Libleralism of Europe of the last century had culture, but the Liberalism of to-day has lost its culture. The Liberalism of the past read books and understood ideas. Modern Liberalism reads only newspapers and makes use of the great liberal phrases of the past only as catch-words and cant phrases for its selfish interests. The Liberalism of the last century fought for right and justice. The false Liberalism of to-day fights only for rights and trade privileges. The Liberalism of the of the past battled for humanity. The false Liberalism of to-day only tries to further the vested interests of capitalists and financiers. If we can imagine one of the great Liberals of the last century who had to do the cruel work of killing kings and almost destroying kingship, rise from the dead, what he would say to the false Liberal of to-day would be in the language of Shakespeare's Brutus:—

What, shall one of us,
 That struck the foremost man of all this world
 But for supporting robbers, shall we now
 Contaminate our fingers with base bribes
And sell the mighty space of our large honours
 For so much trash as may be grasped thus?
 I had rather be a dog and bay the moon

Than such a Roman.

But we will not be altogether hopeless. I believe the eventual result of the present movement called Kolonial Politik will be a revival of true Liberalism in Europe. M. Guizot, in his lectures on European civilization, speaking of the design and function of Middle-age Christian Crusades upon Christendom in Europe, says:

"To the first chroniclers, and consequently to the first Crusaders of whom the former were but the expression, Mohammedans were only objects of hatred and contempt; it is evident that those who thus speak of them do not know them. The histories of the later Crusades speak quite differently; it is clear that they look upon them no longer as monsters; that they have to a certain extent entered into their ideas; that they have lived with them; that relation and even a sort of sympathy have been established between them." Thus, the minds of both, M. Guizot goes on to say, but particularly of the Crusaders were delivered from those prejudices which were the offspring of ignorance. "A step," he says finally, "was thus taken towards the enfranchisement of the human spirit."

This modern Crusade of Europe called Kolonial Politik will eventually complete the enfranchisement of the human spirit in Europe and America. The complete enfranchisement of the human spirit will at last produce a universal true Catholic civilization; a civilization founded not upon a moral culture appealing merely to the passions of hope and fear in man, but upon a moral culture appealing to the calm reason of man, deriving its sanction

not from any power or authority outside, but as Mencius put it, from the innate love in man's nature for mercy, for justice, for order, for truth and for truthfulness.

Under the new civilization freedom for the educated man will not mean liberty to do what he likes, but liberty to do what is right. The serf or the man not yet civilized does not do wrong because he fears *knout* or the policeman's baton in this world and hell fire in the next. But the freed man of the new civilization is he for whom neither the *knout*, nor policemen, nor hell fire is any longer necessary. He does right because he loves to do right; and he does no wrong, not from motive of abject or craven fear, but because he hates to do wrong. In all matters in the conduct of life, he makes the rule not of authority from without but of reason and conscience from within his one rule to follow. He can live without rulers, but he does not live without laws. Therefore, the Chinese call an educated gentleman a 君子 Koen tzu (君 Koen is the same word as German Koenig or King, a kinglet, a little *king* of men.)

The American Emerson, relating an incident of his visit to England when he and Carlyle together visited Stonehenge, the oldest monument in that country, says:

"On Sunday we had much discourse on a rainy day. My friends asked whether there were any Americans—any Americans with an American idea. Thus challenged I bethought myself neither of caucuses nor of congress, neither of presidents nor cabinet ministers, nor of such as would make of America another Europe. I thought only

of the simplest and purest minds. I said, "Certainly, yes; but those who hold it are fanatics of a dream which I should hardly care to relate to your English ears, to which it might be only ridiculous, yet it is the only true one." So I opened the dogma of no-government and non-resistance. I said: "it is true that I have never seen in any country a man of sufficient valour to stand up for this truth; and yet it is plain to me that no less valour than this can command my respect. I can easily see the bankruptcy of the vulgar musket worship and 'tis certain as God liveth, the gun that does not require another gun, the law of love and justice alone can effect a clean revolution."

The future civilization of the world lies as a "*germe de raison*" *qui commence à se développer*, as Du Clos said of the modern Liberalism, in this American idea of Emerson. What is more, this American idea of Emerson lies at the bottom of the Chinese civilization, or rather what may be called the Confucian civilization of the people of the Far East. Herein then lies the moral problem of the Far Eastern question. The solution of that problem does not lie entirely with congress nor with parliaments, neither with emperors, kings, nor with cabinet ministers. The solution lies, to use Emerson's words, with the simplest and purest minds that are to be found in Europe and America. The poets have sung the hymns of this new civilization. The German Heine, who calls himself the Knight of the Battle for the emancipation of the Human Spirit (*Ritter des Menschheit-Befreiungs-Krieges*) sings,

Ein neues Lied, ein besseres Lied,

O Freunde, will ich euch dichten :
 Wir wollen hier auf Erden schon
 Das Himmelreich errichten.

The Scottish Robert Burns sings,
 Then let us pray that come it may,
 As come it will for a' that,
 That sense and worth o'er a' the earth,
 May bear the gree and a' that :
 For a' that, and a' that
 It's coming yet for a' that,
 That man to man the wide warl' o'er,
 Shall brithers be for a' that.

Lastly, the French Béranger sees as in a vision, what he calls the holy alliance of the people (*Sainte alliance des peuples*) and sings,

J'ai vu la Paix descendre sur la terre,
 Semant de l'or des fleurs et des épis :
 L'air était calme et du dieu de la guerre
 Elle étouffait les foudres assoupis.
 Ah ! disait-elle, égaux par la vaillance,
 Français, Anglais, Belge, Russe ou Germain
 Peuples, formez une sainte alliance
 Et donnez-vous la main.



